



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 2022

No. 60

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PAYNE).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 5, 2022.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DONALD M. PAYNE, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 10, 2022, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

RUSSIA DESERVES MORE SEVERE SANCTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to condemn Vladimir Putin and the Russian Army. These brutal and violent thugs have attempted to rehang the Iron Curtain for the sole purpose of committing abject violence against the free and sovereign people of Ukraine. The killing of women and children outside of Kyiv is

a vile act. These acts amount to war crimes.

It is time to deliver the lethal aid that the Ukrainian people need to deter the violent acts that the Russian people commit upon Ukrainians.

It is time to cut off Russian exports to the free world. No country that values the sanctity of life should want to buy their goods from Russia. No place, where free people live, should use the energy that Russian refineries produce be accepted.

The Biden administration must hold the line and impose severe sanctions against Russia for their multiple murderous acts, and the people of Ukraine must know that Americans stand with them in their fight for freedom.

MY LIFE HAS BEEN BLESSED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, it seems like just yesterday when a number of community leaders encouraged me to run for Congress. Against all odds, we ended up winning a very hotly contested Republican primary, and the journey began.

Throughout my career, I have leaned on lessons from my Reagan White House days where my boss and mentor was Ken Duberstein, who later was his chief of staff.

Reagan worked both sides of the aisle to get things done, caring less about who got the credit, and I made a promise that such a principle would be my guiding light. Especially in these days of divided government, that is the only way one can actually get legislation enacted.

There has been something special in my household with highlights and lowlights that we often discuss at the dinner table. As I reflect back, there have certainly been more highlights representing the wonderful and diverse

corner of southwest Michigan. These folks are truly the salt of the earth, and I love them all. I really do, even the few that don't always love me.

As chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee, a huge highlight was 21st Century Cures. Hailed as the most important piece of legislation passed in that Congress, it laid the foundation for Operation Warp Speed and faster drug approvals, including the first vaccine that Pfizer produced in Kalamazoo.

Now, once again, with my partner DIANA DEGETTE, we are pursuing Cures 2.0 with all the disease and patient groups who joined us on Cures.

My driving mission has been jobs and the economy. Whether it was working on a North American energy independent plan, pursuing renewable resources, and, yes, dealing with climate change. Changing the tax laws so that no longer do we have the highest corporate tax rates in the world, which drove so many of our job creators someplace other than America. Being the Republican lead with John Dingell on the auto rescue plan. The industry and all the jobs that came with it was simply too big to fail.

Pipeline safety, protecting the Great Lakes, and our drinking water has also been my focus. Every family in America deserves clean water.

I have been more than willing to stand up for the less fortunate and vulnerable, including my vote last week to cap the price of insulin.

I have had the opportunity to visit our brave troops in harm's way overseas in Iraq and Afghanistan, and witnessed the tragedy of war like we see today with Putin's invasion in Ukraine. It was critical to pass the recent humanitarian and military aid. Yes, it was.

And, of course, I witnessed 9/11 here and pushed hard on the recommendation by the 9/11 Commission to protect against such an attack again.

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4155

As a former Boy Scout, I believe in leaving the campground better than when you found it. I have worked with seven administrations, seven House Speakers. None of them would call me a rubber stamp. If it is good policy for Michigan, it is good enough for all of us.

As a vice chair of the bipartisan Problem Solvers Caucus, we have pushed the envelope to get things done, taking on some complex and often controversial issues that others may want to just sweep under the rug. Immigration reform, including border security, for our Dreamers and farmers, a real honest-to-goodness infrastructure bill that passed 69-30 in the Senate but then hit the rocks here in the House, barely surviving Trump's opposition, despite his call for a proposal twice as expensive with no pay-fors.

I have worked alongside real giants who put principle over politics: Greg Walden, Paul Henry, MIKE ROGERS, Pat Tiberi, Susan Brooks, Charlie Dent, John Lewis, Mike Castle, Henry Hyde, Amo Houghton, Dave Camp, Nancy Johnson, and Don Young were among the best.

I work daily on all things Michigan, particularly with DEBBIE DINGELL, and we have been hitting the road to push for civility. Hopefully, civility and bipartisanship versus discord can rule, not rue, the day.

Current colleagues like CMR, CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS, STEVE WOMACK, MARIO DIAZ-BALART, JOSH GOTTHEIMER, BRIAN FITZPATRICK, TOM COLE, DAVE MCKINLEY, DAN KILDEE, JOHN KATKO, KURT SCHRADER, DEAN PHILLIPS, PETER MEIJER, and my friend Steny cut the mustard, too.

I have been blessed having wonderful, hardworking staff all these years. Yes, two of them—including my chief of staff, Joan Hillebrands—have been on my team 36 years, with another handful between 15 and 20 years. Our district team has worked on so many different casework issues, in the tens of thousands. Throughout the COVID nightmare, we worked with our local bankers to save dozens of small businesses with PPP, and we worked to get vital supplies to our wonderful health facilities and frontline workers, who are still so stressed today.

Even the best of stories has a last chapter. This is it for me. I have done the zillions of airline miles back and forth. I have signed "Fred" to over a million letters; cast more votes than anyone in this Chamber while here; and by most accounts, have succeeded in making a difference, accomplishing what I have set out to do, with more unfinished work still yet to come.

Arthur Brooks recently wrote about three traits most important in life—honesty, compassion, and faith. I would like to think those same yardsticks were passed along to me by my parents, watching on C-SPAN now.

Someone asked my wife, Amey, what would be the next chapter? She said, "and they lived happily ever after." In-

deed, we will. I thank Amey, our two kids, and three grandkids for giving me so much to look forward to.

Thanks again to the people of my district who placed their faith and confidence in me all these years.

God bless the USA.

FRED UPTON HAS BEEN A DEVOTED PUBLIC SERVANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, for 35 years, FRED UPTON has been a devoted public servant for southwest Michigan, all of Michigan, and our Nation.

Throughout his career, he has always put the people he served first. To him, bipartisan and compromise are not forbidden words. Fred knew well that if we are going to deliver real solutions for the American people, we need to come together and listen to all perspectives, no matter how complicated the issue might be. It is because of that thinking, he was able to get so much done in Congress.

I am especially proud of all that we have been able to accomplish together. Thanks to his partnership, we were able to pass legislation to protect the Great Lakes for future generations and lower the cost of healthcare for all Americans. Together, we have championed removing the harmful PFAS chemicals from our Nation's drinking water, and I am confident we are going to get this to the President's desk.

While we may not have found harmony on every issue, Fred and I always managed to disagree without vitriolic rhetoric and mean-spirited language. Even through our toughest discussions, Fred always found a way to make me laugh, except today. It is his civility that I—and Congress—will miss the most.

Fred really believed that he was an American first, that reaching across the aisle was important, that working together is how we get things done for the American people. His retiring is a loss for this country, and especially the people of Michigan.

Fred is a dear friend to me, was John's best friend, and was there when John died. The Dingell family loves him. He is one of the greatest Michiganders to serve our country. I wish him, Amey, and their family the best as they prepare for the next adventure. And there will be one. Thank you, Fred.

CONGRATULATING VMI'S CLUB BOXING TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to express my thanks to the gentleman from Michigan for his years of service to this country, to this body, and to the great State of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Virginia Military Institute Club

Boxing Team, which recently won the United States Intercollegiate Boxing Association National Championships in Atlanta, Georgia. This victory marks the program's second national title in seven years, the last of which came in 2015.

Throughout this year's tournament, the team amassed an impressive 20-8 record, scoring six knockouts, one technical knockout, nine unanimous decisions, and four split decisions. Of the 14 cadets competing, 5 won individual national championship belts, while another 7 took home silver medals. Each of these national champions and runners-up also earned All-American individual honors for their stellar performances in their respective weight classes.

The team's coach, Joe Shafer, credited their win to preparation, dedication, and hard work. Coach Shafer said, "We represented the Institute with a fighting spirit: honoring VMI's history, upholding the passions of our forefathers, and personifying the principles of excellence for VMI."

The cadets certainly showcased the very best of the Virginia Military Institute, and the team should be incredibly proud of their efforts. Congratulations again to these national champions. They made the Commonwealth proud.

AMERICA'S ECONOMIC CRISIS

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is in the midst of an economic crisis, yet the Biden administration fails to take action to ease the burden on American families.

When inflation began to soar and hit a 40-year high recently, the President's own chief of staff shrugged it off as a "high-class problem," insinuating that it was only affecting the wealthy, which we know not to be true.

Instead of offering solutions, this administration offers excuses. Perhaps worst of all is the fact that when given the chance to combat soaring prices by reining in wasteful spending, President Biden went entirely in the opposite direction by proposing a \$5.8 trillion budget that is more of the same liberal, tax-and-spend policies that have led us to this economic crisis in the first place.

If Biden's budget were adopted, the national debt would reach a new record by the end of the decade, growing by over \$15 trillion, reaching \$45 trillion by 2032 or about \$350,000 per household.

Further, not only does his budget proposal include nearly \$2.5 trillion in new or increased taxes, it also increases the corporate tax rate to 28 percent, higher than even Communist China. As an American, I am offended by that. Every American should be offended by that.

The Tax Foundation estimated that this increase would kill 159,000 jobs, shrink the economy by \$720 billion, and cut wages for low-income workers.

President Biden's budget will leave the overwhelming majority of Americans behind, explode the national debt,

and cause inflation to skyrocket even higher. Our citizens deserve better than what their President is giving them.

□ 1015

ALLEVIATING HEALTH DISPARITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to applaud the Democrats working with the Biden administration to achieve the best job creation record in United States history.

Together, we have created 7.9 million jobs and seen the largest decrease in unemployment in history. In March, the national unemployment rate fell to 3.6 faster than expected and reached the lowest level since February 2020.

The United States has now regained 93 percent of the jobs lost during the pandemic. There have been particularly strong gains in the industries integral to addressing supply chain challenges, including manufacturing, construction, transportation, and warehousing.

Despite strong economic growth and wage gains, global price increases make it harder for U.S. workers and families to recover everyday expenses. The higher prices deprive households of the full benefits of the strongest wage growth seen in years.

Investing in children and families, workers, and small businesses, as the building a better America agenda does, would address the root causes of inflation and reduce some of the biggest expenses in our households.

While we are making great strides in ensuring a thriving economy, we must also remain committed to ensuring access to healthcare for all Americans. There is no wealth without good health.

While the Affordable Care Act has been critical in addressing the healthcare gap, we know Black and Brown and low-income families across this Nation are still disproportionately impacted by health disparities.

Allow me to share some daunting data to paint the seriousness of my concerns.

In 2018, approximately 21.5 percent of Hispanic adults over age 20 were diagnosed with diabetes, compared to 13 percent of White adults over the age of 20.

Hispanic women are 40 percent more likely to have cervical cancer and 20 percent more likely to die from cervical cancer than non-Hispanic White women.

There are 11 infant deaths per 1,000 live births among Black women. This is almost twice the national average.

Alleviating health disparities will require a deliberate and sustained effort to address socioeconomic determinants of health, such as poverty, segregation, and environmental degradation.

Furthermore, regarding mortality health, I plan to vote in favor of H.R. 1218, the Data Mapping to Save Moms' Lives Act. This legislation will use data mapping to show where high rates of poor maternal health outcomes overlap with the lack of access to broadband services to help identify where improved access to telehealth services can be most effective.

According to the CDC, severe complications related to pregnancy, known as severe maternal morbidity, impact over 50,000 women in the United States each year. Unfortunately, Black women are three times more likely to die from pregnancy-related causes than White women.

In my own State, Florida ranks 32nd out of the 50 States in the U.S. in terms of the highest maternal mortality rates.

As we continue to create a more robust economy, we must also address health disparities in our Nation, which, in many cases, have led to countless premature deaths.

CALIFORNIA WATER SHORTAGES HURT NATIONAL FOOD SUPPLIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, just a short time ago, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) gave a heartfelt speech about his time in Congress. I want to pass along my appreciation for him, especially his hard work in shepherding through the 21st Century Cures Act just a couple of terms ago.

I appreciate that and his strong work in the Congress. God bless Mr. FRED UPTON.

Mr. Speaker, I get up here and speak a lot about the situation with food availability in this country, farming, the availability of food that comes from farming.

Just recently, President Biden basically promised food shortages around the world and even have effects here in the United States, the land of abundance with the capability of growing much more than our own food supply. There is no reason the United States should be running short of food in any fashion for our own people or in our ability to help other people around the world with exports or the food programs that aid those that are in poor, dire situations in some other countries.

Yet, indeed, my wife just told me a couple of days ago that she was in the market, and there was an entire freezer shelf that was empty in one of the large chains of grocery stores in northern California. How can this be? Why is it?

I know we are coming out of COVID. That caused some problems, but the essential workers were in there pretty much the whole time making it happen, making beef available to our store shelves, everything else.

The farmers probably never really left the fields. There is no reason we should be having shortages.

I still harken back to the story about 30-something years ago when Boris Yeltsin, the President of Russia, came to this country. Along with President Bush at the time, he visited the Johnson Space Center in Houston. On the way out, they stopped at a grocery store there in Texas. Mr. Yeltsin just wanted to see that, I guess, and he was amazed by what was on the shelves of American stores, the bounty we have.

I think it moved him to become emotional about it, and it also moved him to give up his role in the Communist Party in Russia and try to start reforming his country.

Indeed, he was quoted as saying, If the Russian people could see what was on the shelves here, there would be a revolution. That is pretty amazing.

So, what are we doing here in this country? The regulatory agencies and policies that come out of this administration and, of course, the State of California are basically running agriculture off the map. Taking the water away from farmers in California is a big example.

Now, people around the country may be watching and wonder: "Why does that affect me, man, a bunch of California problems? They are all messed up out there anyway." What is important, though, is that so many of these products we grow in California benefit the whole country. There are at least a dozen crops that 90 to 98 percent of them that Americans consume are grown in my home State.

I went to this irrigation district meeting just recently in my district. A whole bunch of farmers were gathered with the district managers there, their board. Indeed, the district is doing everything it can to make a bad situation work just a little bit better. They are using innovative ideas.

But the bottom line is, the water has been taken from them when you are talking Lake Shasta, Lake Oroville, the other projects we have in California, the State project, the Federal project.

How has it been taken? Well, of course, we are going through somewhat of a drought situation, but a lot of it is a man-enhanced drought because so much water has been let out of our storage systems into the delta, ostensibly to help fish, ostensibly to help with water quality.

One of the delta fish we are talking about is known as the delta smelt. It is gone. They go out and take what they call trawls, looking for this species. It isn't there anymore, so they have shifted much of the narrative away from the smelt now to water quality, salinity, such as that.

We get that because some of the bay area intakes for city use are in the delta, and they need to not have saltwater coming into those. So, the freshwater coming down, basically, from the mountains washes that water away. They need some of that flow.

According to statistics I have seen, because I can hardly get a straight answer, six times the flow has been pushed through there as what it would take to maintain that salinity—six times the flow.

So much water is not being captured. California still has a lot of rain and snowpack that falls upon it that is not being captured.

What are we down to? That water district I met with, those farmers are going to receive 7 percent of their flows, 0.4 acre-feet. If you had 100 acres, you would get to plant 7 acres. Can you imagine in any kind of business atmosphere where you get to operate 7 percent of it?

We have to get this right. The Federal Government needs to come in and do its job, not just worship the Endangered Species Act.

BE CONCERNED ABOUT AMERICA, NOT OTHER COUNTRIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, right now, the American people are over \$30 trillion in debt because Congress is incapable of being responsible with the American people's hard-earned tax dollars.

Over \$30 trillion in debt and counting is a sum total that we will never be able to pay back in our lifetimes, our children's lifetimes, our grandchildren's lifetimes, our great-grandchildren's lifetimes, and so forth.

Our dollar is on the verge of crashing. We are also on the verge of being the competitive currency with another foreign country's currency, possibly China. We are not in good shape financially.

We also are looking at 7.9 percent inflation and rising, with nothing to stop it. We are looking at gas prices that are getting so expensive that people can hardly afford to fill up their gas tanks.

Crime is out of control, and there is no reason for that. But coming up, on May 23, the Biden administration is going to suspend title 42, which is going to allow approximately an estimated 18,000 illegal aliens to come across our border.

If you total this up, in over 5 months, we are looking at potentially over 2.7 million people coming in throughout the summer and into the fall. This is unsustainable. This is also against our Constitution and is completely irresponsible.

Now, we have something coming up that Congress is going to be voting on, a 41-page COVID-19 supplemental bill because, for some reason, we are supposed to be spending more money that we don't have on future COVID and future COVID variants and future COVID vaccines because, really, that makes a lot of sense.

Why is that an emergency? It is in the future.

This bill, at \$10 billion, of which up to \$9 billion is for the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority—what is the purpose of that? It is in the future. Is this gain of function research? We have a lot of questions, but we don't have answers.

This is also—for future COVID, by the way—supposed to provide \$750 million in efforts to fight future variants to build future vaccine manufacturing capacity.

Haven't our vaccine manufacturers made enough money when COVID vaccines were mandated across the country? They are still making a lot of money.

We have already spent \$4.6 trillion in resources on COVID, \$4.16 trillion in obligations, \$3.63 trillion in outlays across 44 government agencies.

The U.S. has made \$825 billion in direct payments. The U.S. has issued \$845 billion in loans. The U.S. has given \$540 billion in grants, \$50 billion in contracts, mostly through HHS and Defense, and so forth and on and more spending and more spending. Again, we are over \$30 trillion in debt.

Currently, the death rate for COVID is 1.22 percent. By the way, this death rate has continued to go down, thankfully. We are all thankful for that. Yet, Congress wants to spend more money for future COVID, for future vaccines, and for future variants when there is no need to do so.

What we should be doing is we should be helping Americans get back to work. We should be helping small businesses.

Most of all, we should be securing our southern border to protect our country and our national security interests, and to protect our people, instead of being completely concerned and wrapped up in another country's border and their people.

While we are failing Americans here at home, we are too concerned about countries abroad.

□ 1030

Now, we have other serious problems. We have things that more Americans have been ignored on. There have been approximately 11,943 deaths reported on VAERS, but no investigation. There have also been 1,676 miscarriages reported on VAERS; 5,592 heart attacks reported on VAERS; 5,164 cases of myocarditis reported on VAERS; 13,230 permanently disabled cases reported on VAERS, yet no investigation. But we are supposed to spend \$10 billion on future COVID, future variants, future vaccines?

If we are going to spend some money, why don't we spend some money looking into these cases reported on VAERS?

This is why I introduced the Justice for Vaccine Victims Act of 2022 because there needs to be an investigation.

FARM BILL IMPACT SERIES: THE STATE OF AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to deliver the next installment of my farm bill impact series—the state of agriculture.

We are at the end of the first quarter. National Agriculture Month just ended, and as Congress prepares to authorize the farm bill, we should examine the state of agriculture.

Agriculture is not just a business; it is a rich heritage and a lifestyle. Sadly, the distance from farm to fork has never been greater, and there are fewer legislators who have experience on the farm. Since Congress will reauthorize the farm bill in 2023, I am standing here today to remind Congress that for this legislation to be effective in ensuring the food security, and, therefore, the national security, of our Nation, we need to get in the field and consider the perspectives of farmers, ranchers, and agriculture producers.

Last month, House Agriculture Committee Republican leader G.T. THOMPSON and I did just that on a tour of my district. We went to farms; we toured facilities; we ate at dinner tables; and we listened. We did it because hearing from producers is crucial to legislating well on matters that concern their livelihoods. Today, I will report to Congress on what they have been telling me about the economic, human, and natural resources surrounding their work, and what Kansas producers believe to be the state of agriculture.

A farmer or rancher's economic health depends on things like cash and assets on hand, protections against the government taxing the farm at transfer or death, and well-crafted farm bill programs like crop insurance.

You don't have to look far to know that producers are facing the highest input prices in 40 years. Fertilizer is four to five times higher than it was at this time last year, if you can even get it. Equipment is back-ordered for 6 to 8 months. Parts are at least double the cost. On our trip, Republican leader THOMPSON and I hosted a roundtable with Kansas commodity groups, and all of them told me that if we cannot get input prices and inflation under control, today's farm and tomorrow's crop will be in a much worse condition at this time next year.

The day-to-day trials of operating a successful farm, ranch, or agribusiness are challenging enough without worrying about these skyrocketing prices. Now, President Biden's budget proposal threatens the stepped-up basis and imposes capital gains taxes on farms or ranches that have been held in the family for 90 years or more. This new farm-killer tax would inflict hundreds of thousands of dollars in new capital gains taxes on hardworking Americans and jeopardize family-owned businesses.

The one saving grace for most farmers is that the 2018 farm bill protected

and strengthened their opportunity to utilize crop insurance programs, even when conditions are dire. Largely, farmers want to keep crop insurance in place in the 2023 farm bill. One Kansas farmer even told us that Congress needs to “use a scalpel, not a sledgehammer, as we refine crop insurance.”

Agriculture’s human resources include labor on the farm and employees at the local Farm Service Agency office. On the farm, folks are hurting for workers. We visited one of the first feed yards in the State, and the family owners haven’t seen a labor shortage with looming retirements this bad since before the feed yard’s inception in 1951. Another co-op owner told us their workforce is down 10 percent with more than 70 open positions.

At the local USDA offices, where Kansans go if they need help from the government, staff is also short. Traditionally, there has been a fully staffed USDA office in every county in America, but President Biden’s policies have kept employees at home and turned those offices mostly all virtual. I met with farmers who are at a complete loss trying to navigate convoluted government websites instead of talking face-to-face with USDA employees.

There is a workforce shortage in every industry, and agriculture is no exception. From the farm to government services for the farm, agriculture has been experiencing record employee turnover due to unnecessary vaccine mandates, enhanced unemployment benefits, and more.

And in terms of natural resources, we all know America’s farmers and ranchers are the original conservationists. America has vast amounts of natural resources available to its stewards. The biggest threat to agriculture’s natural resources isn’t availability or the weather, but Federal Government overreach.

Late last year, President Biden withdrew the Navigable Waters Protection Rule, which sought to undo the harm caused by the Waters of the United States rule from 2015, through which the Federal Government aimed to control nearly all bodies of water, regardless of their size or connection to larger waterways. Because of this mess, farmers and ranchers have had to conduct their business under three different definitions of what amounts to “water” in just 6 years.

President Biden has also halted drilling on Federal lands and halted construction on the Keystone XL pipeline, exacerbating the price and shortage of American-made fuel. On our trip, Republican leader THOMPSON and I saw a live oil well operated by a company that produced 60,000 barrels of oil last October from 363 active wells, and right next door, we saw an ethanol plant ready to supply America with dependable liquid fuel if President Biden would just ditch his unrealistic and ill-timed electric vehicle push. You can’t plow with a Prius.

While I recognize things like protections against the harmful Waters of the

U.S. rulings and oil and gas drilling do not live within the confines of the next farm bill, I also recognize that the protections and proper use of America’s resources are vital to the strength of American food and agriculture.

The state of agriculture is strong because of the strength of American farmers, ranchers, and agriculture producers. Congress has the responsibility to get them the resources they need to protect the resources they have to feed, fuel, and clothe the world. We must do our job.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o’clock and 36 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. AUCHINCLOSS) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Holy God, set Your covenant before us this day. Show us how You have bound Yourself to us time and again throughout history and in our own lives. We need yet another reminder of the promises which You have so graciously given to Your people.

Remind us, too, that You expect of us not just righteous, exemplary behavior but accountability and forgiveness. You desire not just our knowledge of scripture and adherence to Your law, but You desire that we check and recheck our attitudes, that they remain examples, reflections of Your steadfast love for all people.

You desire not just that we relish the forgiveness we have found in You, but that we share that mercy with each and all we meet, and that we do so with the same unbounded, uninhibited grace that You have shown us.

Speak to us louder today, O Lord, that we can’t help but hear that You have called us into a marvelous relationship with You that we would then be compelled to share with one another.

Show us Your will, that we can’t help but respond with faithfulness to You and to the needs of the human family with whom we are inextricably bound.

We listen. We wait. We pray to You this day by the fulfilled promise found in Your name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolu-

tion 188, the Journal of the last day’s proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PAYNE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SUPPORTING RESTAURANT REVITALIZATION

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, restaurants have been hit particularly hard during the pandemic, taking on increasing costs while facing huge revenue losses.

Thanks to the American Rescue Plan, the Restaurant Revitalization Fund provided \$28.6 billion for restaurants nationwide and delivered over \$85 million to restaurants in my community.

Still, the demand was greater than the resources made available by Congress, with over 175,000 eligible restaurants that applied for grants through the program going entirely unfunded.

This week, we have the opportunity to fill that gap, support small businesses, and save jobs by passing the Restaurant Revitalization Fund Replenishment Act. I am proud to support this bill and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

After a long, difficult period of isolation, people are coming together and going back to restaurants, but we need to make whole these restaurants that have lost money based on nothing that they have done.

PUT AMERICANS FIRST

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, last week, President Biden announced a decision to repeal one of the best tools our Nation has to deter illegal immigration, title 42.

Title 42 is a public health law that authorized U.S. border agents to promptly send back illegal immigrants if they pose a health risk to Americans

and are from a country with a communicable disease outbreak.

This reckless decision comes as U.S. Customs and Border Patrol warned the historic surge at our border is already worsening, now even more so in anticipation of the rollback of this title.

The U.S. will soon hit 1 million illegal crossings of our borders in just the first half of this fiscal year, which began in October.

Last week, Customs and Border Patrol confirmed that over 300,000 illegal immigrants have illegally entered in just the last 6 months—300,000. This is known as the known got-aways, and the true number is most likely much higher.

Title 42 expulsions account for over half of all expulsions; the ones with the health issues are half of expulsions. They will now be let in.

Where are the concerns about Americans' health? We are just coming off this COVID situation. Where are Americans' health concerns in this?

This is a crazy policy that is not putting Americans first.

SUPPORTING MARIJUANA DECRIMINALIZATION

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about how proud I was to support the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act last week. It decriminalizes marijuana and expunges marijuana arrests from the books.

Marijuana laws have been devastating to minority communities. African and Latino Americans are four times more likely to be arrested for marijuana offenses than are White Americans, and they receive longer prison sentences for the same crimes.

Today, minorities are in prison for offenses that are no longer crimes in most States. This bill would give these Americans a fresh start.

In addition, the bill has an opportunity trust fund to create opportunities for minority marijuana businesses.

It is time we passed this bill and ended the gross injustice of marijuana law enforcement in this country.

PUTIN'S MASS MURDER

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the civilized world is shocked at the discovery of mass murder by Putin in Bucha, Ukraine.

It is inspiring the leadership of President Volodymyr Zelenskyy and the immediate responses by Germany to Italy for expelling Putin's murder-complicit diplomats.

With innocent civilians discovered having their hands tied behind their

backs, shot in the head, it is clear, war criminal Putin must be stopped with immediate military aid.

Biden is correct to recognize this as part of the worldwide conflict of democracy with rule of law versus autocracy with rule of gun.

An undisputed atrocity is the Putin murder of the mayor of Motyzyhn and her family.

I have faith in the Russian people with a great culture betrayed by the war criminal, Putin. There is legislation for defecting Russian troops, diplomats, and Duma members to be provided expedited refugee status to America and up to \$100,000 for any Russian military equipment turned over to Ukraine.

Ukraine will achieve victory. God bless Ukraine. God save Ukraine. Long live Volodymyr Zelenskyy.

Congratulations to Mayor Dan Rickenmann and the city of Columbia for sending aid to Ukraine.

JUSTICE THOMAS SHOULD RESIGN

(Ms. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, the actions of Justice Thomas and his wife, Virginia, have undermined the Constitution.

Ms. Thomas was in direct communication with the Trump White House in a conspiracy to undermine the peaceful transfer of power between Presidents.

Justice Thomas should recuse himself from cases related to his wife's involvement. Yet, he took part in Court rulings and voted to prevent the disclosure of White House communications.

Justice Thomas failed to disclose his wife's nearly \$700,000 in income from The Heritage Foundation, an organization working to stop the January 6 investigation.

Justice Thomas has repeatedly failed to meet his ethical obligations of recusal and disclosure that are expected of a Federal judge.

The American people entrust Members of Congress and the Supreme Court to defend our Constitution, our laws, and our democracy. His wife's involvement in the attempt to overthrow the 2020 election, and Justice Thomas' failure to recuse himself, have made him ethically compromised. He is unfit to be a natural arbiter of justice.

Justice Thomas should resign from the Supreme Court.

RECOGNIZING GOLD STAR SPOUSE DAY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Gold Star Spouse Day.

Today, we honor the surviving loved ones of military servicemembers who

died while serving our country. This day offers remembrance for the spouses and their families as well as a time of recognition of their sacrifices.

As an Army dad, I am blessed my son returned home. I am aware that this is not the case for all families, and we must take the time to remember, the time to respect, and the time to honor the spouses and their families of our fallen servicemembers.

Gold Star Spouse Day brings awareness of the sacrifices and grief these spouses and families have faced in the name of our country.

Mr. Speaker, let us all take a moment to remember that our freedom is not free. Gold Star families have lost a loved one and paid a heavy price, all in the name of protecting our freedom. They deserve our gratitude today and every day.

ENDANGERING AMERICANS' SAFETY

(Mr. MOORE of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, President Biden is planning to lift President Trump's successful title 42, a tragic decision that will endanger every American's safety.

Recent reporting further exposes the devastating consequences of President Biden's doubling down on his far-left, open-border agenda. Not only will Biden's reversal welcome in countless new illegal immigrants, but Biden wants Americans to pay to vaccinate them.

But it gets worse. According to this report, the Biden administration is even considering pulling medical personnel from the Department of Veterans Affairs to assist at the border, taking much-needed medical care away from our veterans, our very own veterans.

I ran for office because of our veterans, because they are not receiving the care they have earned. That is why I have asked to serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

These reports should outrage every patriotic American, regardless of party, Republican or Democrat. We must never prioritize foreign citizens illegally entering our country over our very own veterans.

I was watching this morning, and we see these unaccompanied males coming into our country by the busloads. We have an invasion on our southern border, and our administration, this President's administration, wants to take our veteran care and our healthcare workers to help treat the invading army.

RECOGNIZING ALIYAH BOSTON

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, today, I congratulate Virgin Islander Aliyah

Boston, a college basketball player for the South Carolina Gamecocks, on her win against UConn in the NCAA championship, leading the Gamecocks to their second national championship.

Aliyah was also named the Wade Trophy winner, AP Women's College Basketball Player of the Year, Naismith Defensive Player of the Year, as well as the Women's National Player of the Year.

Go ahead, Aliyah. Thirty consecutive double-doubles.

Her love for basketball was inspired by her sister, nurtured by her mother and father, the sacrifices that they have made and that she has made to be the player that she is.

Hats off to her. We love her. The Virgin Islands is rooting for her next year and every year to come.

SECURE THE BORDER NOW

(Mrs. LESKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, we are at a crisis in America. We are at a crisis in Arizona. The Biden administration and the Democrats have done everything in their power to open the southern border.

On day one, President Biden stopped funding for the border wall. Then, he took away all the good policies that the Trump administration had put in place, and now he is taking away the very last tool that we have to have some kind of semblance of border security at our southern border. He is taking away title 42.

I have spoken to both Border Patrol counsel, and I have spoken this morning to Secretary Mayorkas. We are going to see an even bigger flood of illegal immigrants crossing our border.

The border is totally out of control, flooding our districts with drugs, flooding our districts with people who have been charged with criminal activity in the past, sex slavery.

Please, President Biden, secure the border now.

□ 1215

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

SCHOOL AND DAYCARE PROTECTION ACT

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6387) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a school security coordinating council, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6387

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "School and Daycare Protection Act".

SEC. 2. SCHOOL SECURITY COORDINATING COUNCIL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 714. SCHOOL SECURITY COORDINATING COUNCIL.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department a coordinating council to ensure that, to the maximum extent practicable, activities, plans, and policies to enhance the security of early childhood education programs, elementary schools, high schools, and secondary schools against acts of terrorism and other homeland security threats are coordinated.

"(b) COMPOSITION.—The members of the council established pursuant to subsection (a) shall include the following:

"(1) The Under Secretary for Strategy, Policy, and Plans.

"(2) The Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security.

"(3) The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

"(4) The Director of the Secret Service.

"(5) The Executive Director of the Office of Academic Engagement.

"(6) The Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs.

"(7) Any other official of the Department the Secretary determines appropriate.

"(c) LEADERSHIP.—The Secretary shall designate a member of the council to serve as chair of the council.

"(d) RESOURCES.—The Secretary shall participate in Federal efforts to maintain and publicize a clearinghouse of resources available to early childhood education programs, elementary schools, high schools, and secondary schools to enhance security against acts of terrorism and other homeland security threats.

"(e) REPORTS.—Not later than January 30, 2023, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report regarding the following:

"(1) The Department's activities, plans, and policies aimed at enhancing the security of early childhood education programs, elementary schools, high schools, and secondary schools against acts of terrorism and other homeland security threats.

"(2) With respect to the immediately preceding year, information on the following:

"(A) The council's activities during such year.

"(B) The Department's contributions to Federal efforts to maintain and publicize the clearinghouse of resources referred to in subsection (d) during such year.

"(3) Any metrics regarding the efficacy of such activities and contributions, and any engagement with stakeholders outside of the Federal Government.

"(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms 'early childhood education program', 'elementary school', 'high school', and 'secondary school' have the meanings given such terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting

after the item relating to section 710 the following new item:

"Sec. 714. School security coordinating council."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER) each will control 20 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 6387, the School and Daycare Protection Act.

Over the years, we have seen horrific school shootings from Columbine to Sandy Hook to Parkland.

As a father of triplets, I cannot imagine the pain of those who have lost loved ones to school violence.

As I look back at my time leading the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Recovery, I take pride in the work that we did in the school security space.

Under my leadership, school security was, for the first time in Congress, viewed as a homeland security issue.

The Department of Homeland Security certainly takes that view, too. My bill, the School and Daycare Protection Act, recognizes that there are a diverse range of DHS entities with school and campus security responsibilities and seeks to ensure that activities are coordinated.

H.R. 6387 establishes a standing council within DHS to coordinate school security activities, plans, and policies, and requires DHS to report to Congress about the council's activities.

Additionally, it authorizes DHS to participate in the government-wide SchoolSafety.gov clearinghouse.

Within DHS, there are some incredibly useful school security strategies, tools, and research being produced.

CISA published a K-12 School Security Guide. Secret Service put out an operational guide for preventing targeted school violence. And FEMA maintains a multi-hazard toolkit to help school officials manage everything from tornadoes to active shooters.

H.R. 6387 would help ensure that such DHS school security efforts are coordinated to get education officials actionable tools and support.

A version of this bill passed the House last Congress, and in this Congress, the committee approved it with strong bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my House colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6387, the School and Daycare Protection Act.

This bill establishes a school security coordinating council within the Department of Homeland Security to ensure the coordination of security plans and policies regarding terrorist threats.

Importantly, the bill requires consistent reporting to Congress on metrics regarding the efficacy of such activities and any engagement with the stakeholder community outside of the Federal Government.

Additionally, it ensures that DHS is involved in Federal efforts to maintain and publicize a clearinghouse of resources for schools to assist them in security preparation and planning.

The Federal Government must do all it can to be a resource and to offer support to schools in the face of terrorism.

I commend the gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership on this important issue and ensuring security for all schools.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to join me in supporting H.R. 6387, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank the gentleman for supporting this bill. We know that this is an issue that is of a bipartisan nature. We all want to make sure that our children are safe in school and between home and school.

We all have an interest in getting the best information and resources to school administrators, teachers, and parents to protect our children.

H.R. 6387 focuses on ensuring that DHS is effectively coordinating internally to help combat violence and other terrorist threats facing schools.

Consideration of H.R. 6387 is particularly timely, given how often schools continue to be targeted.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6387, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6387, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY INSPECTOR GENERAL TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5633) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance transparency regarding reports conducted by the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5633

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Homeland Security Inspector General Transparency Act".

SEC. 2. OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting before section 812 the following new section:

"SEC. 811. OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.

"(a) PUBLICATION OF REPORTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Inspector General of the Department shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees any report finalized on and after such date that substantiates—

"(A) a violation of paragraph (8) or (9) of section 2302(b) of title 5, United States Code, section 1034 of title 10, United States Code, or Presidential Personnel Directive-19; or

"(B) an allegation of misconduct, waste, fraud, abuse, or violation of policy within the Department involving a member of the Senior Executive Service or politically appointed official of the Department.

"(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Concurrent with the submission to the appropriate congressional committees of reports pursuant to paragraph (1), the Inspector General shall, consistent with privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties protections, publish on a publicly available website of the Inspector General each such report.

"(B) EXCEPTION.—The requirement pursuant to subparagraph (A) to publish reports does not apply if section (5)(e)(1) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 applies to any such report.

"(3) REQUIREMENT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Department may not redact any portion of a report submitted pursuant to paragraph (1).

"(B) EXCEPTION.—The requirement under subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to the name or any other identifying information, including any contextual details not relevant to the audit, inspection, or evaluation at issue that may be used by other employees or officers of the Department to determine the identity of a whistleblower complainant, of a whistleblower complainant who does not consent to the inclusion of such in a report of the Inspector General.

"(b) SEMIANNUAL REPORTING.—Beginning with the first semiannual report transmitted to the appropriate committees or subcommittees of the Congress pursuant to section 5(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 that is transmitted after the date of the enactment of this section, each such report shall be accompanied by a list of ongoing audits, inspections, and evaluations of the Department, together with a narrative description relating to each such audit, inspection, or evaluation that identifies the scope of such audit, inspection, or evaluation, as the case may be, as well as the subject office, component, or directorate of the Department. For each such ongoing audit, inspection, or evaluation such narrative description shall include the following:

"(1) Information relating to the source of each such audit, inspection, or evaluation.

"(2) Information regarding whether each such audit, inspection, or evaluation is being conducted independently, jointly, concurrently, or in some other manner.

"(3) In the event each such audit, inspection, or evaluation was initiated due to a referral, the

date on which the Inspector General notified the originator of a referral of the Inspector General's intention to carry out such audit, inspection, or evaluation.

"(4) Information relating to the dates on which—

"(A) each such audit, inspection, or evaluation was initiated;

"(B) a draft report relating to each such audit, inspection, or evaluation is scheduled to be submitted to the Secretary for review; and

"(C) a final report relating to each such audit, inspection, or evaluation is scheduled to be submitted to the appropriate congressional committees and published on the website of the Inspector General in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, of subsection (a).

"(5) An explanation for—

"(A) any significant changes to the narrative description of each such audit, inspection, or evaluation, including the identification of the subject office, component, or directorate of the Department; or

"(B) a delay of more than 30 days in the scheduled date for submitting to the Secretary a draft report for review or publishing on the website of the Inspector General of the Department the final report relating to each such audit, inspection, or evaluation.

"(6) Data regarding tips and complaints made to the Inspector General Hotline of the Department or otherwise referred to the Department, including—

"(A) the number and type of tips and complaints regarding fraud, waste, abuse, corruption, financial crimes, civil rights and civil liberty abuse, or other complaints regarding criminal or non-criminal activity associated with fraud, waste, or abuse;

"(B) actions taken by the Department to address or resolve each substantiated tip or complaint;

"(C) the total amount of time it took the Department to so address or resolve each such substantiated tip or complaint;

"(D) the total number of tips and complaints that are substantiated compared with the number of tips and complaints that are unsubstantiated; and

"(E) the percentage of audits, inspections, and evaluations that are initiated as a result of tips and complaints made to the Inspector General Hotline.

"(c) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—The Inspector General of the Department shall notify the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate if the head of an office or component of the Department does not provide in a timely manner to the Inspector General information or assistance that is requested by the Inspector General to conduct an audit, inspection, or evaluation.

"(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'appropriate congressional committees' means the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and any committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate, respectively, having legislative or oversight jurisdiction under the Rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate, respectively, over the matter concerned."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by amending the item relating to section 811 to read as follows:

"Sec. 811. Office of Inspector General."

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) INSPECTOR GENERAL OF DHS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House

of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Comptroller General of the United States a report on the policies, procedures, and internal controls established that ensure compliance with the Quality Standards for Federal Offices of Inspector General from the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency.

(2) COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—Not later than one year after receipt of the report required under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate an evaluation of such report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5633, and yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the author of this bill and the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 5633, the Department of Homeland Security Inspector General Transparency Act, seeks to provide Congress and the public greater insight into the findings of the independent body charged with overseeing the third-largest Federal department.

The DHS Office of Inspector General has the dual mission of detecting waste, fraud, and abuse within the Department and promoting economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of Departmental resources.

Since the establishment of the Department in 2003, Congress has looked to the DHS OIG to provide independent, fact-based analysis into departmental programs, activities, and personnel.

Historically, the DHS OIG has provided critical oversight of the Department, including audits of FEMA following Hurricane Katrina, whistleblower retaliation at the Coast Guard, and conditions at Immigration and Customs Enforcement detention facilities.

Troublingly, for the past 2 years, reports regarding substantiated whistleblower retaliation or misconduct by senior DHS officials have been withheld from Congress and the public.

Last year, the Government Accountability Office released a report that

brought to light significant and long-standing operational weaknesses at the DHS OIG that GAO concluded have impacted the quality and timeliness of the OIG's work.

Separately, an independent government watchdog, the Project on Government Oversight, in July 2021, found that the DHS OIG has repeatedly impeded and delayed ongoing investigations into alleged improper handling of intelligence and whistleblower retaliation.

My bill seeks to ensure that the DHS OIG operates in a more transparent manner with Congress and the public.

Specifically, the legislation requires that the DHS OIG, when it substantiates allegations of whistleblower retaliation or misconduct by senior Department officials, provide those reports to Congress and publish them on its website.

This legislation also requires additional reporting by the DHS OIG in its semiannual report to Congress.

When enacted, the semiannual report would be required to include a description of every ongoing audit, inspection, and evaluation, as well as data on the number and types of complaints and tips that OIG receives.

Finally, H.R. 5633 requires the inspector general to notify Congress if the head of any DHS component or office fails to respond to a DHS OIG request in a timely manner.

The Department of Homeland Security Inspector General Transparency Act has bipartisan support and was reported out of committee by voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my House colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5633, the Department of Homeland Security Inspector General Transparency Act.

An important element of all Federal departments and agencies, especially DHS, is the Office of the Inspector General. Although we all wish there was no waste, fraud, or abuse within government, the reality is it does exist, and it is the inspector general's mission to help the Department identify and address those issues as much as possible.

I am fully supportive of the critical role that IGs play throughout the Federal Government, including my own time serving in the military. They are vital to ensuring accountability and transparency into each department and agency's activities.

This is especially important in a department like DHS with a mission so vital to the security of our country. DHS is tasked with safeguarding the American people, our homeland, and our values against all enemies foreign and domestic.

To do this on a daily basis, we must ensure that the men and women of the Department are able to focus on their mission, and the IG's office ensures this is done with integrity and honor.

This bill, introduced by Chairman THOMPSON, requires the DHS inspector

general to submit to Congress various reports that until now have not necessarily been provided or available to the public. The American public deserves to know.

The requirements in this bill would help to make the IG's office and its important work more transparent not only to Congress but also to the American people.

I urge Members to join me in supporting H.R. 5633, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close after the gentleman closes.

□ 1230

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I am prepared to close. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just as a side note here, we have been talking about transparency in this bill, and I think it is important that we do keep in mind that this is something that helps us in a nonpartisan way, regardless of the administration, and regardless of "who is in power at that time." It is my sincere hope that this particular bill will actually advocate for the mission of DHS and not for political gain, not for political outcome.

It has been my experience in Federal Government that a well-operating and well-oiled machine within the inspector general's office can help to be that check and that balance. And I think at this point in our history in the Department of Homeland Security, we face threats that we have probably never faced in six or seven decades. And we haven't seen the level and the intensity and the magnitude of those threats since before World War II, in my humble opinion.

I believe, with this piece of legislation, that we can get to a point where the Department of Homeland Security does have that check and that balance, and provides the American public the information that is needed and the transparency that is needed.

Whether it is on issues that are cyber; whether it is on issues that are directly targeting our homeland, or even on border issues, we do deserve transparency, and I think that is what the American public is asking for. I believe that is what this bill would do, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

A transparent Office of Inspector General is a critical piece of a functional and effective Department of Homeland Security.

H.R. 5633 seeks to make the DHS OIG more transparent by requiring additional public reporting by the DHS OIG so that the public and Congress know how their tax dollars are spent and can hold the DHS Secretary and other leaders within the department accountable

for wrongdoings by the agency or its personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5633, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORTING EFFICIENTLY TO PROPER OFFICIALS IN RESPONSE TO TERRORISM ACT OF 2021

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1540) to provide for joint reports by relevant Federal agencies to Congress regarding incidents of terrorism, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1540

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Reporting Efficiently to Proper Officials in Response to Terrorism Act of 2021” or the “REPORT Act”.

SEC. 2. DUTY TO REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Whenever an act of terrorism occurs in the United States, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and, as appropriate, the head of the National Counterterrorism Center, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, by not later than one year after the completion of the investigation concerning such act by the primary Government agency conducting such investigation, an unclassified report (which may be accompanied by a classified annex) concerning such act.

(b) CONTENT OF REPORTS.—A report under this section shall—

(1) include a statement of the facts of the act of terrorism referred to in subsection (a), as known at the time of the report;

(2) identify any gaps in homeland or national security that could be addressed to prevent future acts of terrorism; and

(3) include any recommendations for additional measures that could be taken to improve homeland or national security, including recommendations relating to potential changes in law enforcement practices or changes in law, with particular attention to changes that could help prevent future acts of terrorism.

(c) EXCEPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or, as appropriate, the head of the National Counterterrorism Center determines any information described in subsection (b) required to be reported in accordance with subsection (a) could jeopardize an ongoing investigation or prosecution, the Secretary, Attorney General, Director, or head, as the case may be—

(A) may withhold from reporting such information; and

(B) shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of such determination.

(2) SAVING PROVISION.—Withholding of information pursuant to a determination under paragraph (1) shall not affect in any manner the responsibility to submit a report required under subsection (a) containing other information described in subsection (b) not subject to such determination.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ACT OF TERRORISM.—The term “act of terrorism” has the meaning given such term in section 3077 of title 18, United States Code.

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) in the House of Representatives—

(i) the Committee on Homeland Security;

(ii) the Committee on the Judiciary; and

(iii) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and

(B) in the Senate—

(i) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs;

(ii) the Committee on the Judiciary; and

(iii) the Select Committee on Intelligence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1540, the REPORT Act.

In December of 2015, a terrorist attack in San Bernardino, California, left 14 people dead and 22 wounded. Local law enforcement and first responders were heroes that day, saving lives just as they do every day across this Nation.

When terrorists strike our communities, Americans understandably have questions, and they look to us, their elected Representatives, for answers.

Our constituents want to know whether there were warnings or indications of a potential attack; whether anything could have been done to prevent it; and what can be done to thwart future attacks.

H.R. 1540, the REPORT Act, authored by Congressman PETE AGUILAR, seeks to ensure that Members of Congress can be more responsive to their constituents by requiring better communication by Federal agencies with Congress following an attack.

Specifically, the bill would require the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Attorney General and the FBI Director, to submit to Congress an unclassified report within 1 year of completing a terrorism investigation.

The report, which may include a classified annex, must include a statement of facts regarding the attack; information on any homeland or national security gaps that could be addressed to prevent future attacks; and any recommendations for measures, including changes in the law, that would improve homeland or national security.

This vital information needs to be shared by the executive branch with the legislative branch to strengthen our Nation's terrorism response and prevention efforts.

H.R. 1540 is a commonsense measure, and I urge my colleagues to support it. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1540, the Reporting Efficiently to Proper Officials in Response to Terrorism, or the REPORT Act.

Too many times, when a terrorism incident occurs within the United States, consistent and accurate information is not communicated to Congress. Many of us, especially from Texas, experienced this firsthand recently, when a British national, Malik Faisal Akram, took hostages at the Beth Israel Congregation in Colleyville, Texas.

And not only were the initial facts and circumstances of the incident unclear, but many questions remain unanswered regarding Akram's travel and admission into the United States.

This is completely unacceptable. Not only should Congress have all of the necessary information regarding terrorist attacks and other terrorism incidents, but the American people deserve to know what happened and how our government is responding.

The REPORT Act requires the DHS Secretary, the Attorney General, the FBI Director, and the Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, to submit an unclassified report to Congress regarding any incident of terrorism that occurs in the United States. The report must include the following:

A statement of facts; any gaps in our homeland or national security that could be addressed to prevent future acts of terrorism; and recommendations for additional measures, or legislative issues, to improve homeland or national security and prevent future acts of terrorism.

I commend my colleagues, and specifically my colleague from California, for bringing this legislation before the Homeland Security Committee and to the floor today.

I urge Members to join me in supporting H.R. 1540, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR), the author of this commonsense legislation.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from New Jersey for yielding some time.

I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 1540, the REPORT Act. I first introduced the bill, as my colleague mentioned, after the 2015 attack in San Bernardino, a community that I have been proud to represent. This attack tragically took the lives of 14 people and wounded 22. If not for the work of our first responders, more innocent lives would have been lost that day.

The REPORT Act would ensure that lawmakers and law enforcement agencies are better prepared to detect, prevent, and respond to future incidents of terrorism.

If enacted, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Attorney General and the FBI, would submit this unclassified report to Congress whenever an act of domestic terrorism occurs in the United States.

By requiring the executive branch to share their findings with Congress, we, as representatives of our local communities, can act on the recommendations for changes and practices or law to prevent attacks and to protect all communities.

I appreciate my colleague from Texas talking about other incidents, and we know that incidents of mass violence continue to happen across our country, including the moment of silence that we had on the floor last evening.

If we can work together to prevent one such incident from taking place, Mr. Speaker, if both parties can unite to save one innocent life, this legislation will have been a success.

I appreciate the Homeland Security Committee staff for working to get this done, and my colleague from Texas and my colleague from New Jersey for leading this effort.

I ask my colleagues for an “aye” vote.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I think this bill really strikes at the heart of what the Constitution says. We are a coequal branch of government, and the check and the balance on the executive branch, the executive agencies, is very important. We are elected, and we have a responsibility to go to our districts to report back about incidents that are affecting our country negatively.

And it is heartbreaking to hear any sort of terrorist attack, any sort of incident that is aimed at undermining our national security. That is why this committee was formed in the wake of 9/11. The purpose of our committee is to make sure that we have the ability to give the tools to those that are carrying out these missions; whether they are Customs and Border Protection, whether they are TSA agents, or any other agency that is entrusted with protecting the American public.

We deserve to have that transparency, as we have mentioned in a previous bill, and now to be able to report back. So I commend my colleague for bringing this up. And it is my sincere hope, similar to the other bills that we have discussed, that we can, as

a coequal branch of government, offer that check and that balance on the executive branch, regardless of who is in power, regardless of the administration, to provide the necessary tools to continue to protect our country and all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation faces a complex and evolving terrorism threat landscape. We all celebrate the heroic first responders who save lives when an attack occurs, but the American people also expect Congress to respond to attacks and prevent future ones.

The REPORT Act is a commonsense bill that would ensure Congress has the information necessary to do just that.

The REPORT Act received bipartisan support during the committee consideration, and an earlier version of the bill passed the House in the 115th Congress by voice vote.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1540, the REPORT Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1540, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DHS ILLICIT CROSS-BORDER TUNNEL DEFENSE ACT

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4209) to support remediation of illicit cross-border tunnels, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4209

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “DHS Illicit Cross-Border Tunnel Defense Act”.

SEC. 2. COUNTER ILLICIT CROSS-BORDER TUNNEL OPERATIONS.

(a) COUNTER ILLICIT CROSS-BORDER TUNNEL OPERATIONS STRATEGIC PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, in coordination with the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, and, as appropriate, other officials of the Department of Homeland Security, shall develop a counter illicit cross-border tunnel operations strategic plan (in this section referred to as the “strategic plan”) to address the following:

(A) Risk-based criteria to be used to prioritize the identification, breach, assessment, and remediation of illicit cross-border tunnels.

(B) Promote the use of innovative technologies to identify, breach, assess, and remediate illicit cross-border tunnels in a manner that, among other considerations, reduces the impact of such activities on surrounding communities.

(C) Processes to share relevant illicit cross-border tunnel location, operations, and technical information.

(D) Indicators of specific types of illicit cross-border tunnels found in each U.S. Border Patrol sector identified through operations to be periodically disseminated to U.S. Border Patrol sector chiefs to educate field personnel.

(E) A counter illicit cross-border tunnel operations resource needs assessment that includes consideration of the following:

(i) Technology needs.

(ii) Staffing needs, including the following:

(I) A position description for counter illicit cross-border tunnel operations personnel.

(II) Any specialized skills required of such personnel.

(III) The number of such full time personnel, disaggregated by U.S. Border Patrol sector.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS ON STRATEGIC PLAN.—Not later than one year after the development of the strategic plan, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the implementation of the strategic plan.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 and 2024 to carry out—

(1) the development of the strategic plan; and

(2) remediation operations of illicit cross-border tunnels in accordance with the strategic plan to the maximum extent practicable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous materials on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4209, the DHS Illicit Cross-Border Tunnel Defense Act.

Since 1990, more than 200 cross-border tunnels built by smugglers and transnational criminal organizations have done smuggling of illicit drugs, humans, weapons, and money, and have been discovered along the U.S. border with Mexico.

□ 1245

The Border Tunnel Prevention Act of 2012, signed into law by President Obama, enhanced the criminal penalties for unauthorized construction,

financing, or use of a tunnel or subterranean passageway between the U.S. and another country.

Yet, since that time, transnational criminal organizations, or TCOs, continue to construct illicit cross-border tunnels in the hopes of circumventing detection by border authorities.

The tunnels are mainly used to traffic narcotics, such as heroin, fentanyl, and methamphetamine, and facilitate the illicit movement of weapons, contraband, and currency.

Introduced by Congressman PFLUGER, H.R. 4209 seeks to build upon existing law to enhance Customs and Border Protection's capacity to detect and remediate illicit cross-border tunnels. In 2013, CBP established a Tunnel Program Management Office to develop and acquire technology to detect tunnels.

With funding and technological advances, CBP has significantly increased its ability to detect the existence of tunnels. These developments have allowed the agency to progress from manual methods of detection, such as human observation of traffic patterns and routine patrol operations, to the use of sensors to detect, classify, and localize subterranean activity.

To help the Tunnel Program Management Office become more effective, H.R. 4209 provides dedicated funding and requires the development and implementation of a comprehensive and strategic approach to tunnel threats.

In addition to authorizing \$1 million annually to purchase specialized material to seal the tunnels, the bill directs DHS to issue a strategic plan that addresses resource needs, including technology and staffing needs, to identify, assess, and remediate illicit tunnels.

The bill also requires the submission of a report to Congress on activities carried out to implement the strategy.

This legislation is very timely. Just as technology that allows our government to detect the existence of these illicit tunnels has improved, so has the technology used by transnational criminal organizations to construct them.

In January 2020, CBP discovered the longest smuggling tunnel ever found on the U.S.-Mexico border. The tunnel stretched for more than 4,000 feet and was equipped with a makeshift elevator, drainage and air ventilation, and high-voltage electrical cables.

The consequences of not detecting and shutting down these illicit cross-border tunnels stretch far beyond our border communities. The impact of narcotics and weapons making their way into American communities can be devastating.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4209, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4209, my bill, the DHS Illicit Cross-Border Tunnel Defense Act. I thank my colleague from New Jersey for his support.

It is important to say that this is one step. It is not the solution for all the problems that we face at our southern border, but it is one important piece.

Since President Biden took office in January 2021, U.S. Customs and Border Protection has had over 2.2 million migrant encounters along the southwest border.

Due to the sheer numbers of migrants that are flooding across the border, CBP personnel, including Border Patrol agents, are often diverted from their essential jobs, their daily tasks to process migrants, most of whom crossed the United States-Mexico border illegally between ports of entry.

With Border Patrol agents occupied with other tasks and not patrolling the border, the security of our southwest border, and, therefore, the security of our Nation, has been crippled while cartels take full advantage.

In addition to the record number of migrant encounters, CBP has been interdicting growing quantities of illegal narcotics, especially methamphetamines, fentanyl, and other fentanyl-laced drugs, along the border.

For the first time, the United States has reached a tragic record, an unfortunate number of over 100,000 drug overdose deaths in a 1-year period. I want to repeat this: over 100,000 overdose deaths directly related to fentanyl in this past year, the most ever recorded in the United States. Additionally, according to the CDC, fentanyl is now the leading cause of death for Americans aged 18 to 45.

In one of the communities that I represent, Odessa, Texas, law enforcement officials have reported 22 fentanyl overdoses in just 90 days. Parents nationwide are scared for their kids, and there is good reason for that fear. Fentanyl-related deaths nearly doubled the death rates from COVID-19, car accidents, cancer, and even suicide.

We need a plan, a strategy. A cornerstone of this strategy must be to stop the supply of drugs that are flowing into our country.

Mexico is now the primary source of fentanyl and synthetic opioids entering the United States. Of course, smuggling those drugs across the border comes with the risk of packages being seized by our border and law enforcement agencies. To minimize this risk, in 1989, the Sinaloa Cartel built their first-ever narco tunnel, as has been heard this morning on this House floor.

Back then, narco tunnels were short and unsophisticated. Over time, the cartels have learned and perfected these tunnels. They are longer, more sophisticated. They come with lights, with ventilation systems, with rail carts. They facilitate the movement of drugs and other illicit commodities, including the trafficking of people, bulk cash, and weapons.

Since 1990, law enforcement officials have discovered more than 230 of these cross-border tunnels, and there are likely more tunnels that exist between

Mexico and the United States that are yet undiscovered. That is the heart of this bill.

CBP's tunnel technology program has matured over the years. Under the direction of U.S. Border Patrol, this program has been testing and acquiring technologies that do three essential things: predict tunnel locations, detect and project the paths of the tunnels, and confirm a tunnel's existence and location through mapping and measurements.

As CBP develops enhanced capabilities that will do the detection of the tunnels, drug cartels have become more emboldened, and they are creating more elaborate and harder-to-detect tunnel systems. Without this critical legislation, CBP truly lacks the ability to scale their tunnel interdiction and remediation operations.

The DHS Illicit Cross-Border Tunnel Defense Act addresses this issue by requiring CBP to develop a counter tunnel operations plan that would address risk-based criteria for interdicting and remediating illicit tunnels.

They will also look at the processes for sharing information on these tunnels, key indicators of tunnel construction to educate field personnel, and require an assessment of technology and personnel needs.

Additionally, this legislation would authorize funding for CBP to counter tunnel interdiction and remediation operations.

With the surge of illicit border activity both above and below ground, CBP needs resources to combat illicit cross-border tunnels to secure our homeland and protect our national security.

Passage of this legislation will disrupt and dismantle cartel smuggling operations, safeguarding American communities from the illegal narcotics problem that we see is completely devastating our country, including my home State of Texas.

Border security is national security. I thank Chairman THOMPSON and Ranking Member KATKO for bringing this important legislation to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of my bill, H.R. 4209, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his consistent leadership as he serves as chair and ranking member of a number of subcommittees of the Homeland Security Committee. He has been not only an effective manager here on the floor, but he has been a very effective Member and effective leader on so many issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 4209 from my colleague and friend from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

After years of service on the Homeland Security Committee and any number of times going to the border, I would like to first describe and acknowledge that the southern border is many things.

It is a lifeline to desperate people who are fleeing horrible, violent situations that include the decapitating of their sons and daughters or their husbands and even wives. With the violence of some of the oppressive states in Central and South America, where young boys are recruited right out of their homes for gangs, gang warfare, those families are intimidated and frightened if they do not give their boys to these major gangs and cartels.

We have had any number of a series of the flow of massive influx of migrants from the region. Many may come out of desperation for economic reasons, but many come with credible fear. We expect that that may even occur as early as the next couple of months. I implore my colleagues to respond to that desperation in a unified, committed, and dedicated way of Democrats and Republicans reminding themselves that the Statue of Liberty may be along the New York shore, but people view this place as a refuge.

As a resident of Houston, I can attest to the fact that Ukrainians, Afghans, Africans, Haitians, and, yes, those from South and Central America, and as far away as Southeast Asia, are now congregating at the southern border. I, too, was in Del Rio when the massive movement of human beings flowed for desperate reasons.

This DHS Illicit Cross-Border Tunnel Defense Act is what we need as it relates to the known cartels and persons who are desperate to do evil and to bring the goods that will destroy our young and others who are addicted into the United States.

This is the way. They have proudly said that we build tunnels with lights, air-conditioning, in whatever manner to make them palatable to be able to block, if you will, our law enforcement from achieving their goals.

As the first Member of Congress to bring a human trafficking hearing to Houston, which is known as the epicenter of human trafficking, this is vital legislation to stop the scourge of human trafficking, of bringing young children and young women.

We already know that at the Ukrainian borders in different countries, there is trafficking of young kids who are not killed by Putin; that they are trafficking children and women in that crisis situation. They have no moral compass.

This bill, which strengthens DHS' efforts to identify and remediate illicit cross-border tunnels built and utilized by transnational criminal organizations and smugglers on the southwest border, is crucial.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly support the Secretary's direction to issue a strategic plan that addresses resource needs, including technology and staffing needs. What is needed is a million dollars in funding for fiscal years 2023 and 2024 to acquire material to remediate illicit cross-border tunnels.

I have said that they have regular, good living conditions in these tunnels

because they are so extensive. This material includes specialized concrete with enough viscosity to efficiently fill tunnels with fewer insertion points.

We need to combine our efforts as we deal with the scourge of the violent cartels: bloody, guns, intimidating people, and, of course, bringing in illegal entities, some that are human life, into the United States.

□ 1300

The southern border is quite different from the northern border, and we must provide the technology for those who are there.

But as I make that point, Mr. Speaker, I do believe as well that we are never going to get anywhere as Americans, we are never going to win the fight on immigration, on migration, or refugees if we continue to stand in our individual corners. We have to face it. People view this as a beacon of light. You can try to snuff that out, you can try to turn the light off, and you can try to tell them to go back, but they are entrenched with legacy history passed down that this is the place to seek opportunity and refuge.

So I support the legislation. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his hard work. I believe this is an important element to bipartisan commitment to securing our borders in the right way, and I thank him for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman, and the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER).

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman PFLUGER for his leadership on not just this legislation but the issue as a whole because securing our border is so important for Americans and really for security in the rest of the world. It is not an extreme view to make sure that we have control for the safety and security of our people over our borders. So I thank the gentleman for his leadership here, and I am very proud to lend my support to this legislation.

I recently met with a Joint Narcotics Enforcement Team in Lewis County, southwest Washington which I represent, and it is a community bisected by the West Coast's largest freeway, I-5, that runs from Mexico to Canada. These officers reported confiscating hundreds of thousands of pills laced with fentanyl, not to mention record amounts of other illicit drugs.

They told me, about 95 percent of the drugs that they have confiscated come via Mexico and the amount that they confiscate is just a tiny fraction of the flood of drugs that are never seized by law enforcement.

That means what is happening on our borders has a direct and devastating impact on the lives of those in southwest Washington and across our Nation.

A big factor in the success of these drug cartels is underground, illegal tunnels along the southern border.

Last year, U.S. officials found a 183-foot-long subterranean tunnel near the border used by drug traffickers to conduct illegal activities completely undetected by border patrol.

The bill I helped advance for House consideration today would help the Border Patrol shut down these illegal underground tunnels used by cartels to smuggle drugs and conduct human trafficking underneath our southern border.

This is a commonsense and very necessary step to slow the trafficking of drugs and human beings which is being felt not just along the border States but in southwest Washington State and across this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I am prepared to close after the gentleman.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO), who is the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee and my good friend.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the homeland security legislation being considered on the floor today.

Specifically, I would like to acknowledge the two Republican-led bills.

First, H.R. 4209, the DHS Illicit Cross-Border Tunnel Defense Act sponsored by my good friend and colleague, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Intelligence and Counterterrorism, Representative PFLUGER. This important piece of legislation is critical to addressing the rampant challenge of illicit cross-border tunnels used by cartels to traffic people, drugs, and other illicit commodities into the United States. Make no mistake: we must take action to address the crisis levels of fentanyl flowing into our communities.

So far this year, Customs and Border Patrol has seized enough fentanyl to kill 2.4 billion people. Let me say that again. They have seized enough fentanyl to kill 2.4 billion people, or the entire U.S. population, seven times over. Enabling frontline law enforcement to detect and mitigate the use of these tunnels by passing this legislation is an important step we can take to secure the border.

I would also like to thank my other good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MELJER) who leads the Subcommittee on Oversight, Management, and Accountability for introducing H.R. 4476, the DHS Trade and Economic Security Council Act.

The COVID 19 pandemic uncovered many weaknesses in our supply chains. This first became apparent in the early days of the pandemic when the United States struggled to get such basic things as personal protective equipment. More recently, larger issues have surfaced among multiple industries as they struggle to meet demand due to supply chain issues. These issues are so large and profound that they very much impact our national security.

This measure codifies two recommendations made by the Homeland Security Advisory Council on how we can strengthen our Nation's economic security while at the same time combating the growing influence of China on the United States economy.

I commend my colleague, Representative MELJER, for introducing this bill, and I am very proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation. As COVID-19 has galvanized bipartisan concerns about the Nation's economic security, now is the time to act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support both of these important pieces of legislation.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker I think it is important to note here that we are not going to declare victory. Celebrations will be minimal should this bill pass, and I urge my colleagues to vote "aye." I appreciate the support of the gentleman from New Jersey, of the chairman, and of the ranking member.

This is step one out of 100 different steps. As somebody with a military background who was charged with protecting airspace, defensive counter-air, the border is very similar. It is layered. It is not just one piece that really is the magic solution. There are many different approaches that need to be considered.

This is one, as I said, out of hundreds of steps that need to be accomplished to prevent the fentanyl that we just heard about that could kill every American multiple times, to prevent the rest of the drugs that are flowing into our country, to prevent the trafficking and the crime, and really the overwhelming of our local communities.

As I mentioned, in Odessa, Texas, recently, we uncovered the fact that in 90 days we had almost 20 overdoses from fentanyl. It is a layered defense that is required, so many more steps need to be taken. I am proud to sponsor this legislation to continue to push for that defense and that architecture to be in place.

We need strength, we need deterrence, we need resolve, and, most importantly, we need the political will in a nonpartisan way to bring America back together and the Committee on Homeland Security to secure the safety of every single American.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me just commend the gentleman from Texas for this well-thought-out legislation. The challenge of ending the scourge of drugs in our communities is complex as there are many ways these poisons come into our communities.

H.R. 4209 targets illicit cross-border tunnels. By joining me in supporting

this legislation today, Members can help CBP continue to carry out its detection and remediation program in a strategic and commonsense way.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4209 seeks to make smart and bipartisan investments in our Nation's border security. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4209, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4209, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DHS TRADE AND ECONOMIC SECURITY COUNCIL ACT OF 2021

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4476) to establish the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Trade and Economic Security Council and the position of Assistant Secretary for Trade and Economic Security within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4476

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "DHS Trade and Economic Security Council Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. DHS TRADE AND ECONOMIC SECURITY COUNCIL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle H of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 451 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 890B. DHS TRADE AND ECONOMIC SECURITY COUNCIL.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department the DHS Trade and Economic Security Council (referred to in this section as the 'Council')."

"(b) DUTIES OF THE COUNCIL.—The Council shall provide to the Secretary advice and recommendations on matters of trade and economic security, including—

"(1) identifying concentrated risks for trade and economic security;

"(2) setting priorities for securing the Nation's trade and economic security;

"(3) coordinating Department-wide activity on trade and economic security matters;

"(4) with respect to the President's continuity of the economy plan under section 9603 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2021;

"(5) proposing statutory and regulatory changes impacting trade and economic security; and

"(6) any other matters the Secretary considers appropriate.

"(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Council shall be composed of the following members:

"(A) The Assistant Secretary for Trade and Economic Security of the Office of Strategy, Policy, and Plans of the Department.

"(B) An officer or an employee, selected by the Secretary, from each of the following components and offices of the Department:

"(i) The Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency.

"(ii) The Federal Emergency Management Agency.

"(iii) The Office of Intelligence and Analysis.

"(iv) The Science and Technology Directorate.

"(v) United States Citizenship and Immigration Services.

"(vi) The Coast Guard.

"(vii) U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

"(viii) U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

"(ix) The Transportation Security Administration.

"(2) CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR.—The Assistant Secretary for Trade and Economic Security shall serve as Chair of the Council. The Assistant Secretary for Trade and Economic Security may designate a Council member as a Vice Chair.

"(d) MEETINGS.—The Council shall meet not less frequently than quarterly, as well as—

"(1) at the call of the Chair; or

"(2) at the direction of the Secretary.

"(e) BRIEFINGS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section and every six months thereafter for four years, the Council shall brief the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate on the actions and activities of the Council.

"(f) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'economic security' means the condition of having secure and resilient domestic production capacity combined with reliable access to the global resources necessary to maintain an acceptable standard of living and protect core national values."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 890A the following new item:

"Sec. 890B. DHS Trade and Economic Security Council."

SEC. 3. ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR TRADE AND ECONOMIC SECURITY.

Section 709 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 349) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

"(g) ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR TRADE AND ECONOMIC SECURITY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—There is within the Office of Strategy, Policy, and Plans an Assistant Secretary for Trade and Economic Security.

"(2) DUTIES.—The Assistant Secretary for Trade and Economic Security shall be responsible for policy formulation regarding matters relating to economic security and trade, as such matters relate to the mission and the operations of the Department.

"(3) ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES.—In addition to the duties specified in paragraph (2), the Assistant Secretary for Trade and Economic Security shall—

"(A) oversee—

"(i) the activities and enhancements of requirements for supply chain mapping not otherwise assigned by law or by the Secretary to another officer; and

"(ii) assessments and reports to Congress related to critical economic security domains;

"(B) serve as the executive for the Department on the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS), the Committee for the Assessment of Foreign Participation in the United States Telecommunications Services Sector, and the Federal Acquisition Security Council (in addition to any position on such Council occupied by a representative of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency of the Department);

"(C) coordinate with stakeholders in other Federal departments and agencies and non-governmental entities with trade and economic security interests, authorities, and responsibilities; and

“(D) perform such additional duties as the Secretary or the Under Secretary of Strategy, Policy, and Plans may prescribe.

“(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) CRITICAL ECONOMIC SECURITY DOMAIN.—The term ‘critical economic security domain’ means any infrastructure, industry, technology, or intellectual property (or combination thereof) that is essential for the economic security of the United States.

“(B) ECONOMIC SECURITY.—The term ‘economic security’ has the meaning given such term in section 890B.”.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Homeland Security \$3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026 to carry out section 890B and subsection (g) of section 709 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added and inserted, respectively, by sections 2 and 3 of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4476, the DHS Trade and Economic Security Council Act of 2021.

One of the Department of Homeland Security's core missions is to preserve and uphold the Nation's prosperity and economic security. However, in 2020, DHS completed an economic security assessment that found that COVID-19 “laid bare some growing gaps in the U.S. economy, particularly around manufacturing and supply chains for tangible goods.”

To ensure the U.S. has a secure, resilient, and prosperous economy, the assessment concluded supply chain gaps that could be exploited by adversaries should be mitigated.

H.R. 4476 seeks to help minimize such vulnerabilities and enhance economic security efforts at DHS by codifying two existing entities within the Department: one, the DHS Trade and Economic Security Council and, two, the position of Assistant Secretary for Trade and Economic Security.

H.R. 4476 specifies that the mission of the council, composed of members across the Department, is to assist the DHS Secretary with identifying risks to trade and economic security, setting priorities for the Nation's trade and economic security, and proposing changes to enhance economic security.

Additionally, H.R. 4476 outlines what the Assistant Secretary for Trade and Economic Security's responsibilities would be to perform, including supply chain activities and enhancements.

H.R. 4476 will help enhance the reliability of our domestic supply of essential goods to secure our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, January 27, 2022.

Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: I write concerning H.R. 4476, the “DHS Trade and Economic Security Council Act of 2021,” which was additionally referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

In recognition of the desire to expedite consideration of H.R. 4476, the Committee agrees to waive formal consideration of the bill as to provisions that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee. The Committee takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within our jurisdiction. I also request that you support my request to name members of the Committee to any conference committee to consider such provisions.

Finally, I would appreciate the inclusion of this letter into the report on H.R. 4476.

Sincerely,

FRANK PALLONE, Jr.,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 27, 2022.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PALLONE: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4476, the “DHS Trade and Economic Security Council Act of 2021.” I recognize that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has a jurisdictional interest in H.R. 4476, and I appreciate your effort to allow this bill to be considered on the House floor.

I concur with you that forgoing action on the bill does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Energy and Commerce with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future, and I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include our letters on H.R. 4476 in the Committee report on this measure and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill. I look forward to working with you on this legislation and other matters of great importance to this Nation.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4476, the DHS Trade and Economic Security Council Act.

The past few years have been incredibly difficult for Americans across the country, with the COVID-19 pandemic, the supply chain crisis, and record inflation, among many others. These challenges have shown all of us the importance of our economic security and the impact that our economy can have

on both our homeland and/or national security, and that of our partners and allies.

Our reliance on foreign products and manufacturing, from personal protective equipment like masks and gloves to key technology components like computer chips, have had drastic impacts on this country over the past few years.

While there is ongoing work within the Federal Government with regard to trade, supply chain, and economic security, it is clear that we still must do more.

The Department of Homeland Security has a unique position within our government to safeguard the homeland and the American people. This is no longer only limited to overt acts of terrorism as we have talked about today, but the security and stability of our economy is critical to our national security. H.R. 4476 addresses this by codifying the DHS Trade and Economic Security Council as well as the DHS Assistant Secretary of Trade and Economic Security. This will ensure better preparedness of U.S. supply chains in the face of future pandemics, disasters, and emergencies.

I commend my friend from Michigan for his leadership on this issue, and I encourage DHS to lean into its unique role to strengthen our economic security.

Mr. Speaker, I also urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4476, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MEIJER), the leader of this bill.

Mr. MEIJER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4476, the DHS Trade and Economic Security Council Act.

The importance of our Nation's economic security cannot be overstated. For our country, economic security means peace and stability. It means the ability to be entrepreneurs and to freely produce and consume goods and services. For each of us as individuals, it means a secure livelihood, safe communities for our children to grow up in, and opportunities to build new institutions and contribute to society.

The level of economic security that we enjoy depends largely on the flow of goods, services, and information across our borders.

Over the past few years, we have seen this flow interrupted significantly. Our supply chains were challenged and, at times, overwhelmed. Unfortunately, these challenges are likely to continue and increase because of the dependencies we have built on hostile nations, including our overwhelming trade with China.

Vladimir Putin's unprovoked invasion of Ukraine is just another reminder of the global dependency on

Russian energy production and the devastating national security consequences of being economically dependent on our adversaries.

The threats to our economic security are numerous and growing and cannot be overstated. The peace and prosperity of our country is at risk.

We saw the first inklings of this threat at the start of the COVID-19 pandemic when the U.S. could not find enough personal protective equipment for its hospitals and medical providers, and China threatened our security by imposing export restrictions on masks and ventilator components, preventing U.S. companies from getting the deliveries they needed from their own subsidiaries.

This was just the tip of the iceberg. We know that China is working hard to expand its global economic reach in a variety of ways.

A report by the DHS Homeland Security Advisory Council correctly stated that: “DHS has no choice but to play a larger role in economic security issues. It is charged with preparing for all manner of crises . . . from major hurricanes to terrorist attacks.”

The report also highlighted the threat that China poses, and it stated that these new, long-term threats are economic, and the new weapons are trade deals, technological innovation, and critical supply chain dependencies.

The U.S.-China strategic competition is increasingly driven by who controls these underlying systems and the rules by which we advance our economic interests. We cannot allow ourselves to be behind the curve in the next national or global disaster. We need to get ahead of it.

To that end, the report made two recommendations on how the Department can combat China's influence while also contributing to our economic security.

First, the report concluded that to keep the civilian side of our economy functioning in a time of crisis, Congress should institutionalize a politically appointed official to conduct day-to-day policy coordination and who resides within the Office of Strategy, Policy, and Plans. This bill codifies such an assistant secretary position in that office.

Second, the report recommended that DHS institutionalize a council that would identify concentrated economic risks, set priorities, and coordinate enterprise-wide action on economic security matters. This bill follows that recommendation by establishing the DHS Trade and Economic Security Council while also defining its roles and responsibilities.

Codifying these important facets of the Department is a critical step to ensuring our economic security. The work that this council and the assistant secretary will do is critically important to the Nation's response and resilience to the next unforeseen global crisis.

It is crucial that DHS lean into its unique position as the only executive

agency that deals with both the national security and economic prosperity of the Nation and lead the United States Government as the pre-eminent economic security agency in the decades to come.

I am proud to have led this important and timely effort. I thank my friend and colleague, Ranking Member KATKO, for being an original cosponsor, and I also thank Representatives LURIA, DELGADO, and SLOTKIN, in particular, for reaching across the aisle.

Economic security is truly homeland security. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote for this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted America's economic security and exposed supply chain vulnerabilities.

As a proud New Jerseyan, I would like to acknowledge the yeoman's work the Port of New York and New Jersey, the largest container port on the East Coast, has done during the pandemic to meet the demands of the growth in e-commerce and move cargo into our communities in a timely way.

As our economy continues to recover, H.R. 4476 will help ensure that DHS is well-positioned to proactively address potential threats and vulnerabilities that could be exploited by adversaries or exacerbated.

I thank my colleagues on the Homeland Security Committee for unanimously supporting H.R. 4476, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4476, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

RESILIENT ASSISTANCE FOR MITIGATION FOR ENVIRONMENTALLY RESILIENT INFRASTRUCTURE AND CONSTRUCTION BY AMERICANS ACT

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5689) to improve the provision of Federal resources to help build capacity and fund risk-reducing, cost-effective mitigation projects for eligible

State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments and certain private nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5689

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Resilient Assistance for Mitigation for Environmentally Resilient Infrastructure and Construction by Americans Act” or the “Resilient AMERICA Act”.

SEC. 2. PREDISASTER HAZARD MITIGATION.

Section 203(i) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133) is amended by striking “equal to 6 percent” and inserting “equal to not more than 15 percent”.

SEC. 3. NONPROFIT FACILITIES.

Section 203 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) by striking “and local governments” and inserting “, local governments, and private nonprofit facilities”;

(2) in subsection (c) by striking “or local government” in each place it appears and inserting “, local government, or private nonprofit facility”;

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A) by striking “local governments” and inserting “local governments and private nonprofit facilities”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “local governments” in each place it appears and inserting “local governments or private nonprofit facilities”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B) by striking “local government” and inserting “local government or private nonprofit facility”; and

(C) in paragraph (3) by inserting “or private nonprofit facilities” after “any local governments of the State”.

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A) by striking “and local governments” and inserting “, local governments, and private nonprofit facilities”; and

(B) in paragraph (2) by striking “or local government” in each place it appears and inserting “, local government, or private nonprofit facility”;

(5) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (2) by inserting “or private nonprofit facilities located in the State” after “local governments of the State”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(A) by inserting “or private nonprofit facilities located in the State” after “local governments of a State”; and

(6) in subsection (g) by striking “or local government” in each place it appears and inserting “, local government, or private nonprofit facility”.

SEC. 4. BUILDING CODE IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT SET ASIDE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 203(f) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133(m)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) BUILDING CODE IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT SET-ASIDE.—Of the amounts made available under this section for any given year, the Administrator may use not less than 10 percent to carry out eligible activities that further the implementation and enforcement of the latest published editions

of relevant consensus-based codes, specifications, and standards, including any amendments made by State, local, Tribal, or territorial governments to such codes, specifications, and standards, that incorporate the latest hazard-resistant designs and establish minimum acceptable criteria for the design, construction, and maintenance of facilities and residential structures that may be eligible for assistance under this Act. In any fiscal year in which requests for assistance for such activities do not total at least 10 percent of assistance under this section, any remaining funds may be used as additional assistance for the purposes of paragraph (1)."

(b) **LATEST PUBLISHED EDITIONS.**—Section 203(m) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133(m)) is amended by inserting ", (f)(3)," after "subsections (e)(1)(B)(iv)".

(c) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 1234 of the Disaster Recovery Reform Act of 2018 (42 U.S.C. 5133 note) is amended by striking subsection (d).

SEC. 5. RESILIENT INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) **USE OF ASSISTANCE.**—Subsection (g) of section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c(g)) (as redesignated by section 2) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (12)—

(A) by inserting ", wildfire, and ice storm" after "windstorm";

(B) by striking "including replacing" and inserting the following: "including—

"(A) replacing";

(C) in subparagraph (A) (as so designated)—

(i) by inserting ", wildfire," after "extreme wind"; and

(ii) by adding "and" after the semicolon at the end; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) the installation of fire-resistant wires and infrastructure and the undergrounding of wires;"

(2) in paragraph (13) by striking "and"; and

(3) by striking paragraph (14) and inserting the following:

"(14) replacing water systems that have been burned, caused contamination, or are at risk from wildfire impacts with resilient, non-combustible materials;

"(15) repairing, replacing, or retrofitting infrastructure damaged by ice storms to be resilient to the impacts of such storms;

"(16) retrofitting or hardening electric grid infrastructure to comply with the latest published strength standards or industry best practices for resiliency, including standards and practices relating to the strength of utility poles in high wind areas, regardless of height; and

"(17) implementing technologies to improve infrastructure monitoring and distribution for the purpose of reducing risk and avoiding future disaster impacts and, notwithstanding other requirements related to cost-effectiveness, to avoid any unintended consequences under this section and section 203."

(b) **USE OF ASSISTANCE FOR EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS.**—Subsection (h) of section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c(h)) (as redesignated by section 2) is amended—

(1) by inserting "and tsunami" after "earthquake" each place it appears (including in the subsection heading);

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking "and" at the end;

(3) in paragraph (3) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(4) planning, design, or construction of vertical evacuation structures in designated and mapped tsunami danger areas or hazard zones."

SEC. 6. RESIDENTIAL RETROFIT AND RESILIENCE PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall carry out a residential resilience pilot program through the program established under section 203 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133) to make available assistance to State and local governments for the purpose of providing grants to individuals for residential resilience retrofits.

(b) **AMOUNT OF FUNDS.**—The Administrator may use not more than 10 percent of the assistance made available to applicants on an annual basis under section 203 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133) to provide assistance under this section.

(c) **TIMELINE.**—The Administrator shall establish the demonstration program under this section not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and the program shall terminate on September 30, 2025.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report that includes—

(1) a summary of the grant awards and projects carried out under this section;

(2) a detailed compilation of results achieved by the grant awards and projects carried out under this section, including the number of homes receiving retrofits, the types and average costs of retrofits, demographic information for participants in the program, and estimate avoidance in disaster impacts and Federal disaster payments as a result of the grant investments; and

(3) any identified implementation challenges and recommendations for improvements to the pilot program.

(e) **RESIDENTIAL RESILIENT RETROFITS DEFINED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In this section, the term "residential resilient retrofits" means a project that—

(A) is designed to increase the resilience of an existing home or residence using mitigation measures which the administrator determines reduce damage and impacts from natural disaster hazards and risks that are most likely to occur in the area where the home is located; and

(B) to the extent applicable, are consistent with the 2 most recently published editions of relevant consensus-based codes, specifications, and standards, including any amendments made by State, local, tribal, or territorial governments to such codes, specifications, and standards that incorporate the latest hazard-resistant designs and establish criteria for the design, construction, and maintenance of residential structures and facilities that may be eligible for assistance under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) for the purpose of protecting the health, safety, and general welfare of the buildings' users against disasters.

(2) **INCLUSION.**—In this section, the term "residential resilient retrofits" includes—

(A) elevations of homes and elevations of utilities within and around structures to mitigate damages;

(B) floodproofing measures;

(C) the construction of tornado safe rooms;

(D) seismic retrofits;

(E) wildfire retrofit and mitigation measures;

(F) wind retrofits, including roof replacements, hurricane straps, and tie-downs; and

(G) any other measures that meet the requirements of paragraph (1), as determined by the Administrator.

SEC. 7. BUY AMERICA FOR NONEMERGENCY PROJECTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For the purposes of this rulemaking, to ensure that the United States has the productive capability to respond quickly to emergencies and natural disasters with a strong domestic industrial base being in the public interest, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall require, as a condition of any financial assistance provided by the Agency on a nonemergency basis after promulgation of regulations pursuant to subsection (c) for a construction project with a cost of at least \$1,000,000, that the steel and iron used in the project be produced in the United States.

(b) **WAIVER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator may provide a waiver of the requirements in subsection (a) if the Administrator finds—

(A) that the application of such subsection would be inconsistent with the public interest, including causing unreasonable project delays;

(B) that such steel and iron are not produced in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available quantities and of a satisfactory quality; or

(C) that inclusion of domestic material will increase the cost of the overall project contract by more than 25 percent.

(2) **PUBLIC INPUT.**—If the Administrator receives a request for a waiver under this subsection, the Administrator shall make available to the public, on an informal basis, a copy of the request and information available to the Administrator concerning the request, and shall allow for informal public input on the request for at least 15 days prior to making a finding based on the request.

(3) **PUBLICATION OF REQUEST.**—The Administrator shall make the request and accompanying information available by electronic means, including on the official public website of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(c) **RULEMAKING.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the President, acting through the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, shall conduct and complete a rulemaking to establish what considerations shall be used by the Administrator to assess whether a waiver request made pursuant to subsection (b)(1)(A) is in the public interest. Such criteria shall include both a calculation considering domestically produced steel and iron and a calculation with non-domestically produced steel and iron for construction projects which require a Benefit-Cost Analysis in order to qualify for financial assistance.

(d) **ADJUSTMENT.**—The amount in subsection (a) shall be adjusted annually to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Department of Labor.

SEC. 8. REIMBURSEMENT OF INTEREST PAYMENTS RELATED TO PUBLIC ASSISTANCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title IV of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 431. REIMBURSEMENT OF INTEREST PAYMENTS RELATED TO PUBLIC ASSISTANCE.

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of assistance under this title, the President shall provide financial assistance at the applicable Federal share to a State or local government, electric cooperative, or nonprofit organization as reimbursement for qualifying interest.

"(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the following definitions apply:

“(1) QUALIFYING INTEREST.—The term ‘qualifying interest’ means, with respect to a qualifying loan, the lesser of—

“(A) the actual interest paid to a lender for such qualifying loan; and

“(B) the interest that would have been paid to a lender if such qualifying loan had an interest rate equal to the prime rate most recently published on the Federal Reserve Statistical Release on selected interest rates.

“(2) QUALIFYING LOAN.—The term ‘qualifying loan’ means a loan—

“(A) obtained by a State or local government, electric cooperative, or nonprofit organization; and

“(B) of which not less than 90 percent of the proceeds are used to fund activities for which such State or local government, electric cooperative, or nonprofit organization receives assistance under this Act after the date on which such loan is disbursed.”.

(b) RULE OF APPLICABILITY.—Any qualifying interest (as such term is defined in section 431 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as added by this section) incurred by a State or local government, electric cooperative, or nonprofit organization in the 5 years preceding the date of enactment of this Act shall be treated as eligible for financial assistance for purposes of such section 431.

SEC. 9. FUNDING OF A FEDERALLY AUTHORIZED WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECT.

Section 203 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) FUNDING OF A FEDERALLY AUTHORIZED WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 312 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5155) and its implementing regulations, assistance provided under this section may be used to fund activities authorized for construction within the scope of a federally authorized water resources development project of the Army Corps of Engineers if such activities are also eligible activities under this section.

“(2) FEDERAL FUNDING.—All Federal funding provided pursuant to this section shall be applied toward the Federal share of a federally authorized water resources development project described in paragraph (1).

“(3) NON-FEDERAL MATCH.—All non-Federal matching funds required pursuant to this section shall be applied toward the non-Federal share of a federally authorized water resources development project described in paragraph (1).

“(4) TOTAL FEDERAL SHARE.—Funding provided pursuant to this section may not exceed the total Federal share for a federally authorized water resources development project described in paragraph (1).

“(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to affect—

“(A) the cost-share requirement of a hazard mitigation measure under this section;

“(B) the eligibility criteria for a hazard mitigation measure under this section;

“(C) the cost share requirements of a federally authorized water resources development project described in paragraph (1); and

“(D) the responsibilities of a non-Federal interest with respect to such project, including those related to the provision of lands, easements, rights-of-way, dredge material disposal areas, and necessary relocations.

“(6) LIMITATION.—If a federally authorized water resources development project of the Army Corps of Engineers is constructed with funding provided under this subsection, no further Federal funding shall be provided for construction of such a project.”.

SEC. 10. GAO REPORT TO CONGRESS ON CHALLENGES UNDER PUBLIC ASSISTANCE ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the challenges to States and Territories of the United States in obtaining assistance under section 428 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5189f).

(b) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study described in subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall study the challenges for assistance described in subsection (a) faced by the following:

(1) Rural areas, as such term is defined in section 423 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5189a).

(2) Small impoverished communities, as such term is defined in section 203 of such Act.

(3) Other communities, areas, or individuals that the Comptroller General determines pertinent.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report describing the results of the study required under subsection (a).

SEC. 11. APPLICABILITY.

The amendments made by sections 2, 4(a), 8, and 9, and the provisions under section 6, shall only apply to amounts appropriated on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5689, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5689, the Resilient AMERICA Act. This bill reflects a bipartisan agreement that will significantly enhance U.S. mitigation and resilience efforts.

Federal policy that focuses on investment in mitigation and bolstering resilience is basic good governance and will lessen the impacts of future disasters. For years, studies have demonstrated that taxpayers save up to \$11 for every single dollar invested in mitigation before a disaster strikes. There is no better investment.

This legislation builds on existing mitigation efforts and will make our Nation more resilient.

First, this legislation increases the amount of mitigation funding FEMA may make available to States through the Pre-Disaster Mitigation program, also known as BRIC, and makes nonprofits eligible recipients of these funds.

Second, it expands the kind of projects eligible for mitigation assist-

ance through the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program. This includes enhancing the resilience of utilities to risks from wildfire, which will be of great benefit in the Western States.

Third, this legislation sets aside funds for the implementation and enforcement of the latest building codes and standards. Building codes make our buildings safer and more resilient. Proper building codes that account for climate change can mean the difference between saving a family's home and a total loss during a disaster. I strongly support efforts to prepare buildings for actual hazard risks and climate change with updated codes.

Lastly, this legislation creates a pilot program to fund resilience projects at private homes. Often, homeowners cannot implement recommended mitigation efforts, such as creating defensible space to protect against wildfires or removing overhanging branches to remove the risk of damage from severe storms, because they are too expensive.

This pilot program will create the first Federal grant program that allows homeowners to proactively take mitigation into their own hands. I am confident that empowering individuals through this program will make families and their homes more resilient and, again, in the end, save taxpayers money.

Representing a district that was impacted by catastrophic wildfires, particularly in 2020, has made me painfully aware of the importance of the provisions within this legislation. I wish that this bill and the mitigation investments it authorizes could have been enacted prior to the 2020 fires. It may have saved some of my constituents from the trauma of losing their homes.

I thank Ranking Member GRAVES, as well as Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management Chair TITUS and Ranking Member WEBSTER for their support and for working with us on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides to join us and support the Resilient AMERICA Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor H.R. 5689, the Resilient AMERICA Act, along with Chairman DEFAZIO and Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management Chair TITUS and Ranking Member WEBSTER. This bill is going to strengthen our support for communities and individuals in mitigating disasters.

We know that for every dollar invested upfront in mitigation, \$4 to \$11 are saved in damages from a disaster. Given that, one way we lower costs of future disasters is by investing upfront in mitigation.

This bill builds on the bipartisan work that we did on mitigation in the

Disaster Recovery Reform Act of 2018. It ensures mitigation funds are spent and targeted in ways to support efforts by communities and homeowners to save lives and reduce damage.

In my district, my constituents regularly experience flooding that not only causes damage to homes and businesses but disrupts lives and displaces people. Sadly, the time it takes to recover and receive assistance is far too long.

I am glad to see more being done to make commonsense investments on the front end through mitigation projects, which will save taxpayers money. More importantly, it can help save lives.

This bill also has the support of several groups, including the National Association of Home Builders.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter of support from the National Association of Home Builders.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOME BUILDERS, GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, April 5, 2022.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Chairman, House Transportation & Infrastructure Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. SAM GRAVES,
Ranking Member, House Transportation & Infrastructure Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DEFAZIO AND RANKING MEMBER GRAVES: On behalf of the more than 140,000 members of the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB), I write in support of H.R. 5689, the Resilient AMERICA Act. The resilience and pre-disaster mitigation initiatives contained in this bipartisan bill would provide a comprehensive and preemptive approach to reducing the risks of natural disasters while preserving important flexibilities at the state and local levels.

NAHB supports a comprehensive approach to addressing natural disasters through initiatives focused on implementing cost-effective solutions that encourage greater resiliency in the nation's housing stock—while preserving housing affordability. The Resilient AMERICA Act would invest in commonsense mitigation activities, with an emphasis on residential retrofits for improving resiliency in older homes. Expanding mitigation opportunities and creating incentives to facilitate upgrades and improvements to older homes and structures would help to reduce risks and minimize losses from future catastrophes.

NAHB also supports the incorporation of language that respects state and local jurisdictions' control over building code adoption by providing flexibility to adopt one of the two latest published codes. In addition, the bill includes a provision that would provide consistency in how FEMA evaluates which code a jurisdiction has adopted. This language will provide the flexibility needed for communities to take positive steps to withstand and recover from extreme events.

We urge the passage of H.R. 5689 to make American communities more resilient while also protecting important building code flexibilities at the state and local levels.

Thank you for considering our views.

Sincerely,

JAMES W. TOBIN III,
Executive Vice President & Chief Lobbyist.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman DEFAZIO for working with us on this bill as we have all seen the effects of disaster in our districts and across America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two letters of support for H.R. 5689, one from the Build Strong Coalition and one from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

BUILDSTRONG COALITION,
Washington, DC, March 1, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. DINA TITUS,
Subcommittee Chair, House T&I Committee, Washington, DC.

Hon. DANIEL WEBSTER,
Subcommittee Ranking Member, House T&I Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: The BuildStrong Coalition writes to express our strong support for H.R. 5689, the Resilient Assistance for Mitigation for Environmentally Resilient Infrastructure and Construction by Americans (AMERICA) Act, which was passed out of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on October 27, 2021, with almost unanimous backing. The undersigned organizations, as part of the BuildStrong Coalition, urge you to schedule consideration of the bipartisan legislation on the House floor as soon as possible.

This legislation builds on the resilience initiatives contained in the bipartisan infrastructure package and provides additional tools for families, businesses, and communities to reduce climate risks ahead of the next crisis. As our nation's disaster profile becomes increasingly volatile and the instances of severe climate events grow, it is critical that Congress act on this issue.

Important mitigation measures like those included in the Resilient AMERICA Act save lives, property, and taxpayer money, and are crucial for reducing environmental disaster impacts. Multiple studies have demonstrated that for every \$1 spent on preventative pre-disaster mitigation and resilient construction, there is a return of as much as \$11 in savings. Such policies are good for the environment and the economy.

This comprehensive bill contains a host of provisions designed to create a significant number of new resources for communities to better protect themselves ahead of natural catastrophes. This includes policies that would increase funding for the National Public Infrastructure Pre-Disaster Mitigation fund (commonly known as Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities, or BRIC, Program) created by the Disaster Recovery Reform Act to provide grants to local governments for risk-reducing mitigation projects that make homes and infrastructure more resilient in advance of severe climate events, as well as those that would harden communities by creating new resources and incentives for states and localities to adopt and enforce modern constructions standards and building codes. Importantly, the bill will also establish a new pilot program under the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide resources to communities and homeowners for the purpose of retrofitting existing homes and buildings.

The BuildStrong Coalition, formed in 2011 to respond to an increasing number of severe disasters, is made up of a diverse group of members representing firefighters, emergency responders, emergency managers, insurers, engineers, architects, contractors, and manufacturers, as well as consumer organizations, code specialists, and many others committed to building a more disaster

resilient nation. The BuildStrong Coalition has been a partner to Congress's work to investigate causes of, and devise the solutions to, the rising costs and impacts of disasters in the United States.

Our organization represents the broad, bipartisan, public-private, and nonprofit stakeholder support for H.R. 5689. Therefore, the BuildStrong Coalition and its allied partners again ask that it be brought to House floor for consideration under suspension of the rules. We look forward to working with you and are prepared to offer our institutional expertise throughout the process.

Sincerely,
NATALIE F. ENCLADE, PH.D.,
Executive Director, BuildStrong Coalition.

DECEMBER 22, 2021.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: The undersigned organizations support H.R. 5689, the "Resilient Assistance for Mitigation for Environmentally Resilient Infrastructure and Construction by Americans Act" or "Resilient AMERICA Act," and urge you to schedule consideration of this legislation, perhaps under suspension of the rules. This legislation, which was reported from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with strong bipartisan support, would build on the resilience initiatives contained in the recent bipartisan infrastructure law and provide additional tools to reduce risks posed by a changing climate.

For every dollar invested in resilience and pre-disaster mitigation, the taxpayer receives anywhere from \$3.00 to \$11.00 in return. Such policies are good for the environment and the economy. This bill would:

Increase the annual spending for the new National Public Infrastructure Pre-disaster Mitigation fund from up to 6% to up to 15% of postdisaster funding.

Require unspent funds to be recaptured for mitigation and resilience projects.

Extend eligibility for Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) program grant funding to private non-profit organizations.

Provide a 10% set-aside within BRIC to enforce the adoption of newer building codes.

Add wildfires and tsunamis, including strengthening utilities against wind, ice, and wildfire risks as eligible hazards to receive funding.

Establish a 10% set-aside within BRIC to fund residential resilience retrofit grants—upgrades to strengthen homes resilience and comply with consensus-based codes and standards, including wind and roof retrofits, floodproofing, and constructing saferooms.

We strongly support H.R. 5689 and urge that it be brought to the House floor for expeditious consideration. We stand ready to assist you in this process.

Sincerely,

American Council of Engineering Companies, American Institute of Architect, American Planning Association, American Society of Civil Engineers; American Society of Landscape Architects; Build Strong Coalition; City Parks Alliance; Ecological Restoration Business Association; Mississippi River Cities and Towns Initiative; National Association of Clean Water Agencies; National Association of Counties; National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies; National League of Cities; National Recreation and Park Association; National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; Rural Community Assistance Partnership; U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I stand to add my voice to the bipartisan chorus of support for this bill, including the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Mr. DEFAZIO; Ranking Member GRAVES; and the ranking member of my subcommittee, Mr. WEBSTER, for leading on this bill and working so hard to bring relief to not only our communities but individuals who are hit by natural disasters and other calamities like we saw during COVID.

Creating a Federal policy that supports projects focused on mitigating risks and bolstering resilience is good government. There is no two ways about it.

□ 1330

This legislation features a number of key provisions that will make our Nation more resilient:

One, it increases State funding for predisaster mitigation. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

It expands assistance for Western States, like Nevada, that are at the risk of wildfires, which we see coming more often, lasting longer, and being more intense.

It also reserves funds to implement and enforce the latest building codes and standards so when we do build back, we build back better, not to the status quo ante.

It empowers families to proactively take mitigation measures into their own hands, because they may know best what they need there at home.

I strongly support this legislation. We must wake up to the realities of climate change and the increasing intensity and cost of the natural disasters that it causes. This legislation will help to make our Nation more resilient, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Aviation.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, today we spend an average of \$100 billion a year responding to disasters; \$100 billion. This is a number that we can't afford to continue responding, continue reacting to disasters.

The National Institute of Building Sciences has done all sorts of analyses looking at the efficacy of making investments on the front end, Mr. Speaker, so we are not in a situation where, as in the chairman's case, we are having to go into Oregon, Washington, California, or other States out West, and pick up the pieces of these communities destroyed by forest fires; so we don't have to go into these communities that have been impacted by severe winter storms, communities living along rivers that have been inundated by floods, or communities on the southern coast, the Gulf Coast, or the

East Coast that have been pummeled by hurricanes, such as our home State of Louisiana, with just in recent years, Hurricanes Laura, Delta, Zeta, Ida; some of the most powerful hurricanes to ever make landfall in the United States.

The National Institute of Building Sciences has found that for every \$1 you invest in natural mitigation solutions, you get up to \$13 in savings. By adopting more resilient building standards, building codes, you get up to \$11 in savings.

Let me say it again, Mr. Speaker. We can't afford to keep doing this. \$100 billion a year. As Ranking Member GRAVES noted a few minutes ago, back in 2018 we worked on a bipartisan basis to, actually, enact the BRIC program, to really take the PDM, the Pre-Disaster Mitigation grant program, and put it on steroids. Based on the incredible popularity of the program, the progress that has been made, this legislation helps to advance it even further. By increasing the funds that are available and, most importantly, by eating into that \$100 billion we are spending in taxpayer funds every year responding to disasters, reducing that cost, Mr. Speaker, and the most important thing is the actual impact on the ground.

Those communities out West that are dealing with forest fires, helping to stop, prevent, and contain those forest fires.

Those communities that are experiencing devastation from winter storms, helping to protect and make them more resilient.

Communities that are getting repetitive floods, making sure those communities can withstand those floods, and those communities that we represent in south Louisiana that have had hurricane after hurricane that are truly challenging the existence, the livelihood of those communities, helping to make sure they can withstand these storms, and we can continue to live life and enjoy life in coastal communities like south Louisiana.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman DEFAZIO and Chairwoman TITUS, Ranking Member GRAVES, and Ranking Member WEBSTER.

We were able to include two amendments in here. Number one, we worked with Congressman DUNN on a very important amendment. Right now, FEMA takes so long to reimburse communities in the aftermath of a disaster, in many cases our parishes, our counties, and States have to take out loans, so there is an amendment added to this bill that mandates that FEMA pay the interest costs of the loan. If they are going to take forever to reimburse, they can at least cover the loan costs, the interest costs on the loan.

The second one is a government efficiency provision. Right now, the Corps of Engineers has the most arduous process in the Federal Government for developing projects, including cost-to-benefit ratios, environmental analysis,

and technical feasibility, yet under current law, Corps of Engineers' projects are prohibited from receiving funds under the BRIC program or PDM. This fixes it. If that is the best solution, if that is the greatest cost savings, if it is the best efficiency of the dollar, my goodness, we shouldn't be stopping it, we should be incentivizing it.

I want to thank all the folks who worked together on this legislation. I look forward to enactment. I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Ranking Member GRAVES yielding me the time on this as well as the bipartisan effort with Chairman DEFAZIO and everybody on this important legislation.

The Resilient AMERICA Act really, indeed, is like the old adage, a stitch in time saves nine. When you can spend dollars upfront mitigating, such as this bill moves to do, to make a larger pool of money available under FEMA to do so, it just saves a lot of extra pain and suffering.

Mr. GARRET GRAVES talked about the \$100 billion year in, year out we are spending on disaster relief. It is good we do so, but we can nip a lot of this in the bud by applying this type of thinking toward all types of possible disasters.

In my home district, you know, last year the Dixie fire, right at a million acres; the Camp fire before that hit the town of Paradise. You all heard about that in the news, 85 people lost their lives, destroyed 90 percent of the town. Now, if we can get ahead of the curve on this, whatever is applicable for FEMA preassistance, prework, hardening power lines, having buildings that can be hardened with the right materials for their siding and for their roofs. The mitigation we need to be doing in forested areas, whatever is applicable, the more we can do, the better off we are.

We are also looking at flood situations. I have that, too, with the Sacramento River and Feather River in my area, as well as lesser areas, too, in size. Instead of fixing a levee on New Year's Eve in the middle of the night on soggy levees, doing that work ahead of time, upgrading them makes it safer for the workers, safer for the community, and is much less expensive.

This is, indeed, a great success for us in this time, and there is sometimes difficulty here in Congress to have legislation like this with strong bipartisan support that can help everybody. I am proud of the work this committee has been able to do.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, the Resilient AMERICA Act does support the communities by investing in premitigation efforts, and these efforts are going to save lives. It is going to save taxpayer dollars by lowering costs of future disasters. It is going to do so many things.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this important piece of legislation. I again want to thank the chairman for working with us on this. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

We have just heard very telling testimony from the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) about the issues with the frequent problems they have had with hurricanes down there, and then the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) talking about wildfires, which have become more and more intense and widespread and persistent in the West.

On both sides of the aisle, I think almost any Member who has had a disaster, a natural disaster in their district, can attest to the fact that if his or her community had been better prepared, if they had taken steps toward resilience, if the Federal Government had given them that guidance and perhaps some funding incentives to put in place those mitigation measures, that lives would have been saved, property would have been saved, and ultimately the Federal taxpayers would save a lot of money.

This legislation has tremendous merit, and I urge my colleagues to support it unanimously; although, of course, we will have someone on that side of the aisle who will call for a vote even though they might even vote for it. Hopefully, the Senate, in its total dysfunction, will look favorably upon this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5641, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

SMALL PROJECT EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE DISASTER RECOVERY ACT

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5641) to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to increase the

threshold for eligibility for assistance under sections 403, 406, 407, and 502 of such Act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5641

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Small Project Efficient and Effective Disaster Recovery Act” or the “SPEED Recovery Act”.

SEC. 2. SIMPLIFIED PROCEDURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 422 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5189) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking “\$35,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$1,000,000”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(3)—

(A) in the heading by inserting “AND REPORT” after “REVIEW”; and

(B) by inserting “and submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report regarding such review, including any recommendations developed pursuant to such review” after “under this section”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to any amounts appropriated after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5641, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5641, the SPEED Recovery Act. This bill will expedite the approval process for FEMA’s small projects within the public assistance program.

The public assistance process is often slow and impeded by bureaucratic red tape, so FEMA offers a simplified approval procedure for small projects that cost \$139,000 or less. When this program was implemented over 40 years ago, it was intended to capture 95 percent of public assistance project worksheets. There has been a little inflation since then.

Today, as we noted earlier, many disasters are more widespread and more expensive. Today only 75 percent of projects are being captured by the \$139,000 threshold. This legislation will ensure that, once again, 95 percent of project worksheets are eligible for expedited review by raising the qualifying project threshold to \$1 million.

By updating the threshold for what qualifies as a small project, barriers to relief and recovery will be alleviated and so will the time it takes communities to get back on their feet post-disaster, and it will allow the limited staff at FEMA to turn their attention to more difficult, expensive, and problematic programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join with me and support this legislation. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to sponsor H.R. 5641, the SPEED Recovery Act. It is a bipartisan bill that cuts red tape and helps expedite disaster recovery efforts, especially in small and rural areas that we have throughout the country.

This legislation updates the threshold of what FEMA considers a small project. It updates it to \$1 million under the Stafford Act; \$1 million under the Stafford Act. This is the first statutory adjustment under the Stafford Act for inflation and rising repair costs in nearly three decades.

Historically, small projects have accounted for about 95 percent of all the recovery projects, but the prolonged failure to increase the cost threshold now means that 25 percent of these projects no longer qualify as small projects. That puts a huge burden on small rural communities that simply don’t have the same kind of resources to deal with the bureaucracy at FEMA. For places like Craig, Missouri, or Brunswick, Missouri, both of which got hammered by the flood of 2019, it has meant more delays and headaches just trying to get the help that they need to recover and to rebuild.

Updating the small project threshold is going to allow these communities to have more control over their disaster recovery efforts and to allow FEMA to focus more of their time and resources on larger and much more complex projects, which represent 90 percent of all disaster costs.

After hearing directly from the communities in my district about the paperwork burdens and the increasing denials over technicalities, my hope is that this commonsense adjustment to the small project threshold is going to improve the process and speed up recoveries for many, many of our communities. We have also received a lot of support for this bill from emergency managers themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a joint letter of support from the National Emergency Management Association, the Big City Emergency Managers, and the International Association of Emergency Managers.

IAEM, NEMA, BCEM,
September 10, 2021.

Hon. DINA TITUS, *Chairwoman*,
Hon. DANIEL WEBSTER, *Ranking Member*,
*Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public
Buildings, and Emergency Management,*
*Committee on Transportation and Infra-
structure, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN TITUS AND RANKING MEMBER WEBSTER: On behalf of the three associations representing state and local emergency management nationwide, we wish to convey our support for the efforts of Representative Graves of Missouri to introduce the Small Project Efficient and Effective Disaster (SPEED) Recovery Act.

When managing a disaster under the Stafford Act with assistance through the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), projects falling below a certain threshold are considered "small." While this threshold is adjusted annually for inflation, the Fiscal Year 2020 level was a mere \$131,000. These small projects require less administrative burden at the local, state, and federal levels which means their approval and execution time is significantly faster than larger projects. The SPEED Recovery Act will raise this threshold to \$1,000,000, thereby significantly increasing the number of projects that can be expedited during the recovery to a disaster.

This type of modernization to disaster response and recovery programs will allow us as emergency managers to more swiftly move projects for disaster survivors and expedite the road toward recovery. As we work individually and with one another to build resilience nationwide, tools such as the SPEED Recovery Act will simplify and streamline FEMA programs when survivors need them most.

We thank Representative Graves for his foresight on this issue and appreciate your leadership in ensuring the SPEED Recovery Act sees action in your subcommittee and throughout the legislative process. Please contact NEMA Deputy Director Matt Cowles, IAEM Director of Government Affairs Thad Huguley or BCEM Executive Director Ron Prater if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

SIMA MERICK,
NEMA President.
JUDSON FREED,
*CEM, IAEM-USA
President.*
MARK SLOAN,
BCEM President.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1345

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS), the chair of the subcommittee.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time.

The SPEED Recovery Act will expedite the approval process for FEMA's small projects within the Public Assistance Program, or PA program.

I am proud to join Chairman DEFAZIO, Ranking Member GRAVES, and my subcommittee ranking member, Mr. WEBSTER, in bringing this bill forward.

PA helps communities remove debris, implement emergency protective services, and repair damage to public buildings and infrastructure.

The public assistance approval process can be lengthy and complicated,

and that is why, as you have heard, the 1988 Stafford Act ordered FEMA to simplify the procedure for small projects that might not have the capacity or resources to deal with the red tape and complicated grant process.

The cost for completing a small project, however, is not the same as it was in 1988 when this was first established. Stakeholders have reported to Congress, and I heard during a hearing of my subcommittee back in October, that the small projects the program was intended to cover are now unqualified. This legislation will raise the qualifying project threshold, and this updated threshold will speed the postdisaster recovery process and help us to make our communities get back on their feet.

I support this. You heard it; that it is commonsense legislation. I ask my colleagues to do the same, use some common sense and vote to support this.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member GRAVES for yielding time.

Today, I rise in support of H.R. 5641, the SPEED Recovery Act, which is bipartisan legislation introduced by Ranking Member GRAVES with the support of Chairman DEFAZIO, Chair TITUS, and Ranking Member WEBSTER.

This bill aims toward updating disaster recovery procedures. I can talk about that at length.

During Puerto Rico's recovery from Hurricane Maria, many municipalities on the island faced the situation where, because of the rising costs of materials and labor, relatively simple projects such as a repair to a street or a minor building exceeded the current threshold for what is defined as a small project.

That threshold today is around \$123,000, which really only covers some minor work. This means that a lot of the work for which municipalities may have had the resources to cover their non-Federal share to start and finish promptly instead had to go through the full procedural chain for major projects to qualify for FEMA reimbursement.

Those processes themselves have taken longer than expected. It took almost 4 years in the case of Puerto Rico after the 2017 hurricanes for those municipalities, FEMA, and the Puerto Rico Recovery Office to be able to agree just on the measures to make the processes faster.

That is years in which the people wondered when they were going to see the promised reconstruction. When a community does not see at least small things being taken care of, that weakens our communities and promotes displacement.

Increasing the threshold to \$1 million, including adjustments for inflation, would allow more recovery projects to proceed under simplified procedures, reduce administrative bur-

dens, and provide more certainty for all. This is a major step, and that is the reason I am supporting this bill.

Most disaster claims are on a small, local scale where there is no need to navigate the same procedures over larger, more complex projects and tie up the resources of FEMA and other agencies just looking at those papers. Although FEMA and other agencies have been open to using the administrative flexibility the law provides, in many real-world incidents, that is not enough.

These updates make the Stafford Act language match the realities of construction costs in our States, territories, and communities, which FEMA and the local authorities can then use in order to facilitate approval of the small projects.

Believe me, this is the biggest burden we have in the case of Puerto Rico. Four years after the hurricanes, we are still dealing with this.

Many heads of agencies, Cabinet members, and administrative positions from FEMA and the rest of the Federal agencies still travel to the island to see how they can do this faster, and it is not just red tape. It is amending this kind of language that will provide for those projects to be sped up.

I support this commonsense bipartisan legislation and urge all Members to support it, and I thank the ranking member for doing this.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) for the time.

Here we have again another triumph of legislation coming together that can be beneficial at no great new cost to the process.

The Stafford Act has needed updating, certain aspects, for a long time. When you look at some of the difficulties when you are in a postdisaster situation of having to deal with some arcane legislation and laws, it just makes much more suffering than is necessary for people who have been victims, in my case, from many wildfires in northern California.

In adhering to the approximate 95 percent of projects being under the new threshold, that still keeps with what had been set in place way back in 1988. H.R. 5641 is a triumph in that.

Also, with it at 10 percent of total funding for disasters, we are not blowing the budget on this either.

It is, indeed, very important because when you are talking about my rural district or rural America, you don't have the wherewithal to be hassling your way through some of these processes in order to get things going again postdisaster.

In my area, for example, towns like Whiskeytown, Happy Camp, Hornbrook, Concow, Yankee Hill, Magalia, Paradise, Doyle, Canyon Dam,

Greenville, Indian Falls, and others I couldn't possibly all list here today, they are all going to be beneficiaries and appreciative of this effort because they don't have the ability, small counties like Plumas County and Lassen County, to have to deal with some of the restrictions previously under the Stafford Act.

This would be a big win for anybody facing disaster, a small town, or even large, around this country. This is another win for us legislatively, and I appreciate the effort of the committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5641, the SPEED Recovery Act, is a commonsense, bipartisan bill that is going to help many small and rural communities respond to and recover from disasters with less delay and much less bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this very important piece of legislation. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This is a needed adjustment in the cap, very long overdue. It will expedite assistance to individuals, but it also will free up FEMA staff for more meaningful chores and work on ongoing and future disasters, mitigation, recovery, et cetera.

It has tremendous merit, and I urge that all of my colleagues support this legislation.

It will pass by voice vote, and then someone on that side will jump up and call for a recorded vote because that is why they think they are supposed to be here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5641, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

UPHOLDING THE FOUNDING DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND ESTABLISHING A CENTER FOR DEMOCRATIC RESILIENCE

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 831) calling on the United States Government to uphold the founding democratic principles of

the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and establish a Center for Democratic Resilience within the headquarters of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 831

Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is the world's preeminent political and military alliance committed to democracy and the collective defense of its members;

Whereas the preamble of NATO's founding North Atlantic Treaty, signed in Washington, DC, on April 4, 1949, declares the alliance is "founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law";

Whereas democracies across the alliance face external threats from authoritarian regimes such as Russia and China and internal threats from proponents of illiberalism;

Whereas Russia launched a full-scale invasion of sovereign and democratic Ukraine on February 24, 2022, placing it on the frontlines in the contest between democratic values and autocracy;

Whereas in his address to Congress, President Zelensky remarked "Right now, the destiny of our country is being decided. The destiny of our people, whether Ukrainians will be free, whether they will be able to preserve their democracy.";

Whereas Vladimir Putin's unprovoked full-scale invasion of Ukraine has united the NATO alliance;

Whereas there is a broad agreement within the alliance of the need to strengthen the democracies of NATO members, partners, and aspirant countries;

Whereas, in April 2020, NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg appointed an independent Reflection Group tasked with supporting a forward-looking reflection process meant to strengthen the political dimension of the alliance;

Whereas the Reflection Group's report, "NATO 2030: United for a New Era", included analyses and recommendations for the alliance to address "'democratic recession,' the global erosion of democratic norms, and the rise of authoritarianism", including—

(1) "A shared democratic identity is what distinguishes the Alliance from the principal threats and challenges it faces.";

(2) "NATO should reassert its core identity as an Alliance rooted in the principles of democracy.";

(3) "Any commitment to strengthening NATO's political cohesion therefore has to be orientated toward those shared values and ideals, grounded in democracy, rule of law and individual liberty."; and

(4) recommending the establishment of a Center of Excellence for Democratic Resilience in order to strengthen NATO democracies against external threats;

Whereas the Brussels Summit Communiqué issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Brussels on June 14, 2021, stated—

(1) "NATO is the strongest and most successful Alliance in history. It guarantees the security of our territory and our one billion citizens, our freedom, and the values we share, including individual liberty, human rights, democracy, and the rule of law.";

(2) "State and non-state actors challenge the rules-based international order and seek to undermine democracy across the globe."; and

(3) "We reaffirm the Alliance's shared democratic principles as well as our commit-

ment to the spirit and the letter of the North Atlantic Treaty.";

Whereas in Brussels the Allies also committed to updating NATO's Strategic Concept;

Whereas NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg has reiterated that one of the primary purposes of updating the Strategic Concept must be a recommitment to the founding values of the alliance;

Whereas the NATO Parliamentary Assembly supports a new Strategic Concept that reaffirms that the support and strengthening of democratic institutions is foundational to the collective security of Allies;

Whereas Russia's full-scale invasion of sovereign and democratic Ukraine underscores the importance of placing shared democratic values at the heart of NATO's Strategic Concept; and

Whereas the NATO Parliamentary Assembly has endorsed and advanced a proposal to establish a NATO Center for Democratic Resilience within NATO headquarters for the purposes of monitoring and identifying challenges to democracy, human rights, and the rule of law and facilitating democracy and governance assistance to member, partner, and aspirant states, when requested: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms its unequivocal support for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as an alliance founded on democratic principles;

(2) urges NATO to continue to provide unwavering support to the people of Ukraine as they fight for their sovereignty, territorial integrity, and a democratic future;

(3) calls on the President to use the voice and vote of the United States to adopt a new Strategic Concept for NATO that is clear about its support for shared democratic values and committed to enhancing NATO's capacity to strengthen democratic institutions within NATO member, partner, and aspirant countries; and

(4) calls on the President to use the voice and vote of the United States to establish a Center for Democratic Resilience within NATO headquarters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 831, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GREG MEEKS and Ranking Member MIKE MCCAUL for helping bring this bipartisan resolution to the floor today.

I also want to thank my partner in so much of this enterprise with respect to NATO and the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

H. Res. 831, which we introduced together, Mr. TURNER and I, calls on the

United States Government to uphold the founding democratic principles of NATO and establish a Center for Democratic Resilience within NATO itself.

NATO's founding document, signed here in Washington, D.C., on April 4, 1949, this very week, is clear: NATO is an alliance of democracies.

The preamble to the treaty notes the determination of allies "to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law."

The alliance's commitment to shared democratic values is what distinguishes NATO from any other military alliance. Without it, NATO is just another military bloc that does not like Russia.

This commitment cannot remain purely aspirational or rhetorical. It must be operationalized. That is why we believe we need formal architecture within NATO dedicated to the promotion and advocacy of democracy.

There are divisions and units within NATO dedicated to collective defense, terrorism, interoperability, hybrid warfare, cyber, climate change, and a number of other security challenges. But after 72 years, there is not even a broom closet at NATO headquarters dedicated to the promotion of democratic institution-building within the alliance itself or with respect to the members.

□ 1400

The effort to establish a NATO Center for Democratic Resilience is an idea first proposed in 2019 as part of a white paper this Member of Congress wrote on "NATO at 70."

As the current president of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, I have taken that recommendation and made the strengthening of NATO's founding democratic values our number one priority.

The assembly has, in turn, endorsed this idea, the establishment of a Center for Democratic Resilience and made it a central component of the assembly's pro-democracy agenda within NATO.

And we were pleased to see the proposal included in the Group of Experts' report commissioned by the NATO Secretary General as we prepare for updating the strategic concept.

The U.S. delegation to the NATO PA, which includes Chairman MEEKS and Representatives MIKE TURNER of Ohio, LINDA SÁNCHEZ, BRETT GUTHRIE, RICK LARSEN, NEAL DUNN, BRENDAN BOYLE, JACK BERGMAN, DINA TITUS, AUSTIN SCOTT, and Filemon Vela, has jointly written to the Secretary of State, Antony Blinken, and our Secretary of Defense, Lloyd Austin, encouraging the Biden administration to work with our NATO allies to operationalize support for our shared democratic principles and to establish this Center for Democratic Resilience.

And to the credit of the Biden administration and the U.S. Ambassador to NATO, Julie Smith, they have followed up on our recommendation.

When we met with the North Atlantic Council in February in Brussels, Ambassador Smith made a forceful case for the establishment of the center, and we were encouraged to see several NATO Ambassadors join her in taking up the mantle and arguing in favor of the proposal.

Today, the values upon which the alliance have been founded are being challenged by external enemies of democracy, all too tragically being witnessed in the Ukraine.

These forces aim to undermine the faith in and political support for our common democracies and the alliance itself.

The strongest weapon we possess to counter effectively Putin or Xi's authoritarianism is a vibrant, robust, and immutable expression of the liberal democratic values that bind us.

Putin's renewed, full-scale aggression against Ukraine is a blatant attack on the most basic principles underlying the international order since the end of World War II, principles which Moscow has freely signed on to but ignored. President Putin seeks to crush Ukraine's democracy, intimidate other countries where the embers of democratic ambition burn, and, by implication, undermine all democracies everywhere.

We must respond by uniting around and strengthening our commitment to our shared democratic values and the rules-based order. The NATO treaty is clear: We are an alliance of democracies.

As NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg said during the recent ministerial in Riga, Latvia: "NATO was created to defend democracy, freedom, and the rule of law. These values define who we are. They are not optional."

And as President Zelenskyy of Ukraine said during his recent address to this body, to the Congress: "Right now, the destiny of our country"—Ukraine—"is being decided. The destiny of our people, whether Ukrainians will be free, whether they will be able to preserve their democracy."

NATO stands for the preservation of that democracy. And we believe the center called for in this resolution must be part of NATO's work to build a bulwark against authoritarianism and democratic backsliding as we proceed.

I thank the bipartisan group of members of the U.S. delegation to NATO PA for their support as they joined us in this effort, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this strong bipartisan resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

NATO is the most successful military alliance in history.

Our shared democratic values are a critical piece of that success. We are reminded of the importance of this alliance daily as Putin continues his inhu-

mane assault on innocent civilians in Ukraine.

Together, with our NATO allies and partners, we are unified in a strategic approach to counter our adversaries.

Ukraine is not alone on the front lines of the global battle between democracy and authoritarianism. The United States and our NATO allies are supporting Ukraine.

Vladimir Putin's unprovoked and unjustified full-scale invasion of Ukraine has unified the NATO alliance.

Most recently, the world watched in horror as images from Bucha have surfaced; mass graves and bodies strewn throughout the street.

NATO must be resolute in its efforts to continue its support for Ukraine.

This resolution introduced by Congressman CONNOLLY and myself will affirm the democratic values of NATO and establish a Center for Democratic Resilience.

Having served as the President of NATO PA, I support the fundamental role this organization plays in strengthening and defending democracies worldwide. I also congratulate my colleague for his efforts in support of this global organization, Congressman CONNOLLY, who currently serves as the President of NATO PA, has represented the United States very well there, and brings forth a resolution that is of great importance to the founding issues and certainly the substance of NATO.

The resolution we are considering today advances this goal by reaffirming that NATO is an alliance founded on democratic principles and calling on the U.S. to support the establishment of this center within NATO headquarters.

This center would and could monitor challenges and threats to democracy, natural rights, and the rule of law among member nations. Partnering with democracy promotion organizations, the center will assist member states and aspiring member states to preserve and foster democracy among their ranks.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join me today in support of this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Ohio for his leadership. He is the former President of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, as well, and he has provided unwavering support for America's leadership in this alliance and for the alliance itself. And he is a highly respected figure on both sides of the Atlantic, and I thank him for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, both of whom have served as not only Members of this House and members of the parliamentary assembly, but both have led that body as president emeritus and our current president, Mr. CONNOLLY.

I was there in Brussels with my colleagues just a month ago in the days immediately preceding Vladimir Putin's brutal Russian invasion of Ukraine. And there our delegation, on a bipartisan basis, made the case for this resolution, made the case for why such a center is needed now more than ever.

We are seeing an attack not only on the people of Ukraine, but on our democratic values. They are at stake in a way today that they haven't been since the fall of the Berlin Wall. And in some sense, they haven't been under this sort of attack since 1945.

I am proud to be a part, as Mr. CONNOLLY mentioned, of our NATO Parliamentary Assembly. We will be going this weekend to another such NATO PA meeting.

This association, this alliance is needed now more than ever. I am so proud to see this country redouble its commitment to the alliance, but as Mr. CONNOLLY has said time and time again, this cannot just be an alliance built on our shared interest, it must be an alliance based on our shared values.

So I strongly support this resolution, and I urge its unanimous bipartisan adoption.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and former president of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, MIKE TURNER, for yielding.

Today, I am here as a proud cosponsor of H. Res. 831. I stand alongside our esteemed colleagues, the president of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, Congressman GERRY CONNOLLY, and past president, Congressman MIKE TURNER, to support the establishment of a Center of Democratic Resilience within NATO.

Just yesterday, we celebrated 73 years since the formation of NATO, an alliance that has assured mutual defense to one another. Beyond our strategic military alliances, we also share a commitment to our democratic principles. And I think that is the most important thing about this resolution.

Establishing an entity designed to promote, protect and strengthen democratic institutions will further advance the collective security of our allies and NATO's mission of promoting freedom, human rights, democracy, and of course, the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor to serve as a parliamentary member twice during my time in Congress, and both have given me the opportunity to witness NATO's defining trait, which is unity.

Unity does not simply mean presenting a united front. It means being united in spirit and purpose.

Today, as Russia wages war on NATO's borders, that unity of purpose is more important than ever. It is also clear that Ukraine shares in our spirit and purpose as well.

That is why this resolution urges NATO to continue to provide unwaver-

ing support to the people of Ukraine as they fight for their sovereignty, territorial integrity, and a democratic future.

We cannot, and we must not, allow Russia to dictate the terms of a sovereign nation's policy. I continue to support Ukraine to be afforded the opportunity to join our defensive alliance. I think it is clear that the past attempts to placate through indefinite delays for Georgia and Ukraine have ended in tragedy.

Tragedy struck Georgia in 2008, and Ukraine again in 2014 and 2020, and are evidence of how effective denying them membership to NATO is for protecting peace.

Evidence, especially in Bucha, indicates sanctioned mass killings, the rape and murder of small children, and targeting of civilian shelters housing infants and the elderly. All while the Russian leadership talks of a country that doesn't exist.

Together, NATO must continue to present a united front. We must increase, of course, our aid to Ukraine, and we must ensure that countries make decisions to enter alliances without foreign interference. And this is the reason this resolution is so important, because of our principles and our united purpose. We must never cede an inch of our freedom or our values. I know that united, we can do this.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise with concern about some of the wording in the preamble. I think this is the reason why we should actually go through the normal process, not a suspension process for something as critical as this resolution.

Clearly, I have no argument against the threat that Russia has against democracies in Europe. My problem is with page 2, line 3: "... internal threats from proponents of illiberalism." That is a progressive, leftwing dog whistle for Poland and Hungary. Why in the world, as Russia is attacking Ukraine, and Poland is the center for bringing our military assistance into Ukraine, why in the world in a preamble would we appear to attack one of our NATO allies?

It is unnecessary. It is unwise.

Again, having a Center for Democratic Resilience, I don't have an argument with that. My argument is with the preamble that clearly includes inflammatory language toward two of our best allies in NATO: Poland and Hungary.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I would inform Congressman HARRIS, the Ambassador to NATO from Hungary openly supports this center, and I know Poland does also.

This is something that is important overall for NATO, and it does have the support of both of those nations, and there is no intention other than to support democracy in this.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, all I can say is having authored this language, I don't know what the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS) is referring to.

When we talk about illiberal forces within the NATO alliance, it is all-inclusive. The New York Times did an extensive podcast series on illiberal, rightwing groups within Germany's police and military; not Hungary, not Poland; Germany.

Many of our colleagues, when we meet in NATO Parliamentary Assembly meetings, express concern about their own internal challenges to their own democratic institutions.

□ 1415

And it is simply false that we are somehow selecting any particular country. This is a concern expressed by virtually all; and we recognize that we have got work to do in showing up and building democratic institutions, even within the alliance; that we can't take it for granted.

What we say is democracy is resilient, but it can also be fragile; and that is what this reference is about, and would be recognized by virtually every NATO member as such.

So while I certainly can understand Mr. HARRIS wanting to express a concern, I would hope we have debunked it because it is nowhere even close to being what he has characterized.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think this is a really important resolution. It is also timely because, as Mr. BOYLE indicated, we have our next NATO Parliamentary Assembly meeting in Athens this weekend; and if we are going to have input to the strategic concept of NATO, which is being revised and will be adopted next month, in May, we have got to have this in hand as an expression, a bipartisan expression of the collective concern and commitment of this body.

I am honored by the fact that this is bipartisan. It passed the House Foreign Affairs Committee overwhelmingly, and I would hope that later today we have a strong bipartisan vote on this resolution so we can bring it to our deliberations in Athens and in Madrid in the next 2 months.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 831, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1445

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. DINGELL) at 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1218;
H.R. 2501;
H.R. 4209;
H.R. 5689;
H.R. 5641; and
H. Res. 831.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

DATA MAPPING TO SAVE MOMS' LIVES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1218) to require the Federal Communications Commission to incorporate data on maternal health outcomes into its broadband health maps, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 11, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—409

Adams	Banks	Bonamici
Aderholt	Barr	Bost
Aguilar	Barragán	Bourdeaux
Allen	Bass	Bowman
Allred	Beatty	Boyle, Brendan
Amodei	Bentz	F.
Armstrong	Bera	Brady
Arrington	Bergman	Brooks
Auchincloss	Beyer	Brown (MD)
Axne	Bice (OK)	Brown (OH)
Babin	Bilirakis	Buchanan
Bacon	Bishop (GA)	Buck
Baird	Blumenauer	Bucshon
Balderson	Blunt Rochester	Budd

Burchett	Gonzales, Tony	Malliotakis
Burgess	Gonzalez (OH)	Maloney,
Bush	Gonzalez,	Carolyn B.
Bustos	Vicente	Maloney, Sean
Butterfield	Gooden (TX)	Mann
Calvert	Gosar	Manning
Cammack	Gottheimer	Mast
Carbajal	Granger	Matsui
Cárdenas	Graves (LA)	McBath
Carey	Graves (MO)	McCarthy
Carl	Green (TN)	McCaul
Carson	Green, Al (TX)	McClintock
Carter (LA)	Griffith	McCollum
Carter (TX)	Grijalva	McEachin
Cartwright	Grothman	McGovern
Case	Guthrie	McHenry
Casten	Harder (CA)	McKinley
Castor (FL)	Harris	McNerney
Castro (TX)	Harshbarger	Meeks
Cawthorn	Hartzler	Meijer
Chabot	Hayes	Meng
Cherfilus-	Hern	Meuser
McCormick	Herrell	Mfume
Chu	Herrera Beutler	Miller (WV)
Cicilline	Higgins (LA)	Miller-Meeks
Clark (MA)	Higgins (NY)	Moolenaar
Clarke (NY)	Hill	Mooney
Cleaver	Himes	Moore (AL)
Cline	Hinson	Moore (UT)
Cloud	Hollingsworth	Moore (WI)
Clyburn	Horsford	Morelle
Clyde	Houlahan	Moulton
Cohen	Hoyer	Mrvan
Cole	Hudson	Mullin
Comer	Huffman	Murphy (FL)
Connolly	Huizenga	Murphy (NC)
Cooper	Issa	Nadler
Correa	Jackson	Napolitano
Costa	Jackson Lee	Neal
Courtney	Jacobs (CA)	Neguse
Craig	Jacobs (NY)	Nehls
Crawford	Jayapal	Newhouse
Crenshaw	Jeffries	Newman
Crist	Johnson (GA)	Norcross
Crow	Johnson (LA)	O'Halleran
Cuellar	Johnson (OH)	Oberholte
Curtis	Johnson (SD)	Ocasio-Cortez
Davids (KS)	Johnson (TX)	Omar
Davis, Danny K.	Jones	Owens
Davis, Rodney	Jordan	Palazzo
Dean	Joyce (OH)	Pallone
DeFazio	Joyce (PA)	Palmer
DeGette	Kahele	Panetta
DeLauro	Kaptur	Pappas
DelBene	Katko	Pascrell
Delgado	Keating	Payne
Demings	Keller	Pence
DeSaulnier	Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter
DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Perry
Deutch	Kelly (PA)	Peters
Diaz-Balart	Khanna	Pfluger
Dingell	Kildee	Phillips
Doggett	Kilmer	Pingree
Donalds	Kim (CA)	Pocan
Doyle, Michael	Kim (NJ)	Porter
F.	Kind	Posey
Duncan	Kinzing	Pressley
Dunn	Kirkpatrick	Price (NC)
Ellzey	Krishnamoorthi	Quigley
Escobar	Kuster	Raskin
Eshoo	Kustoff	Reed
Españillat	LaHood	Reschenthaler
Estes	LaMalfa	Rice (NY)
Evans	Lamb	Rice (SC)
Fallon	Lamborn	Rodgers (WA)
Feenstra	Langevin	Rogers (AL)
Ferguson	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (KY)
Fischbach	Larson (CT)	Rose
Fitzgerald	Latta	Rosendale
Fitzpatrick	LaTurner	Ross
Fleischmann	Lawrence	Rouzer
Fletcher	Lawson (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Foster	Lee (CA)	Ruiz
Fox	Lee (NV)	Ruppersberger
Frankel, Lois	Leger Fernandez	Rush
Franklin, C.	Lesko	Rutherford
Scott	Letlow	Ryan
Gallagher	Levin (CA)	Salazar
Gallego	Levin (MI)	Sánchez
Garamendi	Lieu	Sarbanes
Garbarino	Lofgren	Scalise
Garcia (CA)	Long	Scanlon
Garcia (IL)	Lowenthal	Schakowsky
Garcia (TX)	Lucas	Schiff
Gibbs	Luetkemeyer	Schneider
Gimenez	Luria	Schrader
Gohmert	Lynch	Schrier
Golden	Mace	Schweikert
Gomez	Malinowski	Scott (VA)

Scott, Austin	Stewart	Veasey
Scott, David	Strickland	Velázquez
Sessions	Suozy	Wagner
Sewell	Swalwell	Walberg
Sherman	Takano	Walorski
Sherrill	Taylor	Waltz
Simpson	Tenney	Wasserman
Sires	Thompson (CA)	Schultz
Slotkin	Thompson (MS)	Waters
Smith (MO)	Thompson (PA)	Watson Coleman
Smith (NE)	Tiffany	Weber (TX)
Smith (NJ)	Timmons	Webster (FL)
Smith (WA)	Titus	Welch
Smucker	Tlaib	Wenstrup
Soto	Tonko	Westerman
Spanberger	Torres (CA)	Wexton
Spartz	Torres (NY)	Wild
Speier	Trahan	Williams (GA)
Stansbury	Trone	Williams (TX)
Stanton	Turner	Wilson (FL)
Stauber	Underwood	Wilson (SC)
Steel	Upton	Wittman
Stefanik	Valadao	Womack
Steil	Van Drew	Yarmuth
Steube	Van Duyne	Zeldin
Stevens	Vargas	

NAYS—11

Biggs	Gaetz	Miller (IL)
Bishop (NC)	Good (VA)	Norman
Boebert	Greene (GA)	Roy
Fulcher	Massie	

NOT VOTING—9

Brownley	Davidson	Hice (GA)
Carter (GA)	Emmer	Loudermilk
Cheney	Guest	McClain

□ 1522

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 110.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Barragán	Fulcher (Meuser)	Mace (Timmons)
(Correa)	Gonzalez (OH)	McHenry
Brown (MD)	(Kinzing)	(Wagner)
(Trone)	Gosar (Gaetz)	Porter (Wexton)
Cárdenas	Harder (CA)	Price (NC)
(Gomez)	(Gomez)	(Butterfield)
Carter (LA)	Hartzler	Roybal-Allard
(Blunt)	(DesJarlais)	(Pallone)
Rochester)	Huffman	Schakowsky
Castro (TX)	(Stanton)	(Garcia (IL))
(Correa)	Johnson (TX)	Scott, David
Cawthorn (Nehls)	(Jeffries)	(Jeffries)
Cooper (Correa)	Joyce (OH)	Sires (Pallone)
Crawford (Long)	(Garbarino)	Suozy (Beyer)
Crist	Kahele (Mrvan)	Taylor (Fallon)
(Wasserman)	Kirkpatrick	Walorski
Schultz)	(Pallone)	(Wagner)
Cuellar (Correa)	Lamborn (Wilson	Wilson (FL)
Evans (Mfume)	(SC))	(Blunt)
Frankel, Lois	Lawson (FL)	Rochester)
(Wasserman)	(Wasserman	
Schultz)	Schultz)	

SPECTRUM COORDINATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2501) to require the National Telecommunications and Information Administration and the Federal Communications Commission to update the memorandum of understanding on spectrum coordination, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 6, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—418

Adams	Courtney	Hayes
Aderholt	Craig	Hern
Aguilar	Crawford	Herrell
Allen	Crenshaw	Herrera Beutler
Allred	Crist	Higgins (LA)
Amodei	Crow	Higgins (NY)
Armstrong	Cuellar	Hill
Arrington	Curtis	Himes
Auchincloss	Dauids (KS)	Hinson
Axne	Davidson	Hollingsworth
Babin	Davis, Danny K.	Horsford
Bacon	Davis, Rodney	Houlihan
Baird	Dean	Hoyer
Balderson	DeFazio	Hudson
Banks	DeGette	Huffman
Barr	DeLauro	Huizenga
Barragán	DelBene	Issa
Bass	Delgado	Jackson
Beatty	Demings	Jackson Lee
Bentz	DeSaulnier	Jacobs (CA)
Bera	DesJarlais	Jacobs (NY)
Bergman	Deutch	Jayapal
Beyer	Diaz-Balart	Jeffries
Bice (OK)	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Billirakis	Doggett	Johnson (LA)
Bishop (GA)	Donalds	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (NC)	Doyle, Michael	Johnson (SD)
Blumenauer	F.	Johnson (TX)
Blunt Rochester	Duncan	Jones
Boebert	Dunn	Jordan
Bonamici	Ellzey	Joyce (OH)
Bost	Escobar	Joyce (PA)
Bourdeaux	Eshoo	Kahele
Bowman	Espallat	Kaptur
Boyle, Brendan	Estes	Katko
F.	Evans	Keating
Brady	Fallon	Keller
Brooks	Feenstra	Kelly (IL)
Brown (MD)	Ferguson	Kelly (MS)
Brown (OH)	Fischbach	Kelly (PA)
Brownley	Fitzgerald	Khanna
Buchanan	Fitzpatrick	Kildee
Buck	Fleischmann	Kilmer
Bucshon	Fletcher	Kim (CA)
Budd	Foster	Kim (NJ)
Burchett	Fox	Kind
Burgess	Frankel, Lois	Kinzing
Bush	Franklin, C.	Kirkpatrick
Bustos	Scott	Krishnamoorthi
Butterfield	Fulcher	Kuster
Calvert	Gaetz	Kustoff
Cammack	Gallagher	LaHood
Carbajal	Gallego	LaMalfa
Cárdenas	Garamendi	Lamb
Carey	Garbarino	Lamborn
Carl	Garcia (CA)	Langevin
Carson	Garcia (IL)	Larsen (WA)
Carter (GA)	Garcia (TX)	Larson (CT)
Carter (LA)	Gibbs	Latta
Carter (TX)	Gimenez	LaTurner
Case	Gohmert	Lawrence
Casten	Golden	Lawson (FL)
Castor (FL)	Gomez	Lee (CA)
Castro (TX)	Gonzales, Tony	Lee (NV)
Cawthorn	Gonzalez (OH)	Leger Fernandez
Chabot	Gonzalez,	Lesko
Cherfilus-	Vicente	Letlow
McCormick	Good (VA)	Levin (CA)
Chu	Gooden (TX)	Levin (MI)
Cicilline	Gosar	Lieu
Clark (MA)	Gottheimer	Lofgren
Clarke (NY)	Granger	Long
Cleaver	Graves (LA)	Loudermilk
Cline	Graves (MO)	Lowenthal
Cloud	Green (TN)	Lucas
Clyburn	Green, Al (TX)	Luetkemeyer
Clyde	Griffith	Luria
Cohen	Grijalva	Lynch
Cole	Grothman	Mace
Comer	Guthrie	Malinowski
Connolly	Harder (CA)	Malliotakis
Cooper	Harris	Maloney,
Correa	Harshbarger	Carolyn B.
Costa	Hartzler	Maloney, Sean

Mann	Pfluger	Stauber
Manning	Phillips	Steel
Mast	Pingree	Stefanik
Matsui	Pocan	Steil
McBath	Porter	Steube
McCarthy	Posey	Stevens
McCaul	Pressley	Stewart
McClain	Price (NC)	Strickland
McClintock	Quigley	Suozzi
McCollum	Raskin	Swalwell
McEachin	Reed	Takano
McGovern	Reschenthaler	Taylor
McHenry	Rice (NY)	Tenney
McKinley	Rice (SC)	Thompson (CA)
McNerney	Rodgers (WA)	Thompson (MS)
Meeks	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (PA)
Meijer	Rogers (KY)	Tiffany
Meng	Rose	Timmons
Meuser	Ross	Titus
Mfume	Rouzer	Tlaib
Miller (IL)	Roybal-Allard	Tonko
Miller (WV)	Ruiz	Torres (CA)
Miller-Meeks	Ruppersberger	Torres (NY)
Moolenaar	Rush	Trahan
Mooney	Rutherford	Trone
Moore (AL)	Ryan	Turner
Moore (UT)	Salazar	Underwood
Moore (WI)	Sánchez	Upton
Morelle	Sarbanes	Valadao
Moulton	Scalise	Van Drew
Mrvan	Scanlon	Van Duyne
Mullin	Schakowsky	Vargas
Murphy (FL)	Schiff	Veasey
Murphy (NC)	Schneider	Velazquez
Nadler	Schrader	Wagner
Napolitano	Schrier	Walberg
Neal	Schweikert	Walorski
Neguse	Scott (VA)	Waltz
Nehls	Scott, Austin	Wasserman
Newhouse	Scott, David	Schultz
Newman	Sessions	Waters
Norcross	Sewell	Watson Coleman
O'Halleran	Sherman	Weber (TX)
Obernolte	Sherrill	Webster (FL)
Ocasio-Cortez	Simpson	Welch
Omar	Sires	Wenstrup
Owens	Slotkin	Westerman
Palazzo	Smith (MO)	Wexton
Pallone	Smith (NE)	Wild
Palmer	Smith (NJ)	Williams (GA)
Panetta	Smith (WA)	Williams (TX)
Pappas	Smucker	Wilson (FL)
Pascrell	Soto	Wilson (SC)
Payne	Spanberger	Wittman
Pence	Spartz	Womack
Perlmutter	Speier	Yarmuth
Perry	Stansbury	Zeldin
Peters	Stanton	

NAYS—6

Biggs	Massie	Rosendale
Greene (GA)	Norman	Roy

NOT VOTING—5

Cartwright	Emmer	Hice (GA)
Cheney	Guest	

□ 1531

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Barragán	Frankel, Lois	Kirkpatrick
(Correa)	(Wasserman	(Pallone)
Brown (MD)	Schultz)	Lamborn (Wilson
(Trone)	Fulcher (Meuser)	(SC))
Cárdenas	Gonzalez (OH)	Lawson (FL)
(Gomez)	(Kinzing)	(Wasserman
Carter (LA)	Gosar (Gaetz)	Schultz)
(Blunt	Harder (CA)	Mace (Timmons)
Rochester)	(Gomez)	McHenry
Castro (TX)	Hartzler	(Wagner)
(Correa)	(DesJarlais)	Porter (Wexton)
Cawthorn (Nehls)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Cooper (Correa)	(Stanton)	(Butterfield)
Crawford (Long)	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Crist	(Jeffries)	(Pallone)
(Wasserman	Joyce (OH)	Schakowsky
Schultz)	(Garbarino)	(Garcia (IL))
Cuellar (Correa)	Kahele (Mrvan)	Scott, David
Evans (Mfume)		

(Jeffries)	Sires	Taylor (Fallon)	Wilson (FL)
(Pallone)	(Beyer)	Walorski	(Blunt
Suozzi		(Wagner)	Rochester)

DHS TRADE AND ECONOMIC SECURITY COUNCIL ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4476) to establish the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Trade and Economic Security Council and the position of Assistant Secretary for Trade and Economic Security within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 348, nays 75, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—348

Adams	Clarke (NY)	Garcia (CA)
Aderholt	Cleaver	Garcia (TX)
Aguilar	Clyburn	Gimenez
Allred	Cohen	Golden
Amodei	Cole	Gomez
Armstrong	Comer	Gonzales, Tony
Auchincloss	Connolly	Gonzalez (OH)
Axne	Cooper	Gonzalez,
Bacon	Correa	Vicente
Baird	Costa	Gottheimer
Balderson	Courtney	Graves (LA)
Barr	Craig	Graves (MO)
Barragán	Crawford	Green (TN)
Bass	Crenshaw	Green, Al (TX)
Beatty	Crist	Grijalva
Bentz	Crow	Guthrie
Bera	Cuellar	Harder (CA)
Bergman	Curtis	Harshbarger
Beyer	Dauids (KS)	Hayes
Bice (OK)	Davidson	Herrell
Billirakis	Davis, Danny K.	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (GA)	Davis, Rodney	Higgins (LA)
Blumenauer	Dean	Higgins (NY)
Blunt Rochester	DeFazio	Hill
Bonamici	DeGette	Himes
Bost	DeLauro	Hinson
Bourdeaux	DelBene	Hollingsworth
Boyle, Brendan	Delgado	Horsford
F.	Demings	Houlihan
Brady	DeSaulnier	Hoyer
Brooks	Deutch	Hudson
Brown (MD)	Diaz-Balart	Huffman
Brown (OH)	Dingell	Huizenga
Brownley	Doggett	Issa
Buchanan	Doyle, Michael	Jackson Lee
Bucshon	F.	Jacobs (CA)
Budd	Duncan	Jayapal
Bustos	Dunn	Jeffries
Butterfield	Ellzey	Johnson (GA)
Calvert	Escobar	Johnson (OH)
Carbajal	Eshoo	Johnson (SD)
Cárdenas	Espallat	Johnson (TX)
Carey	Evans	Jones
Carl	Feenstra	Joyce (OH)
Carson	Fischbach	Kahele
Carter (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Kaptur
Carter (LA)	Fleischmann	Katko
Cartwright	Fletcher	Keating
Case	Foster	Kelly (IL)
Casten	Fox	Kelly (MS)
Castor (FL)	Frankel, Lois	Kelly (PA)
Castro (TX)	Franklin, C.	Khanna
Chabot	Scott	Kildee
Cherfilus-	Fulcher	Kilmer
McCormick	Gallagher	Kim (CA)
Chu	Gallego	Kim (NJ)
Cicilline	Garamendi	Kind
Clark (MA)	Garbarino	Kinzing

Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin

Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Obernoite
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires

Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Takano
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Womuth
Zeldin

NAYS—75

Allen
Arrington
Babin
Banks
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bowman
Buck
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Cammack
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
DesJarlais
Donalds
Estes
Fallon
Ferguson
Fitzgerald
Gaetz

NOT VOTING—6

Cheney
Emmer

Guest
Hice (GA)

Johnson (LA)
Loudermilk

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Correa)	Fulcher (Meuser) Gonzalez (OH) (Kinzing)	Mace (Timmons) McHenry (Wagner)
Brown (MD) (Trone)	Gosar (Gaetz) Harder (CA) (Gomez)	Porter (Wexton) Price (NC) (Butterfield)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Hartzer (DesJarlais)	Roybal-Allard (Pallone)
Carter (LA) (Blunt)	Huffman (Stanton)	Schakowsky (García (IL))
Rochester) Castro (TX) (Correa)	Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Scott, David (Jeffries)
Cawthorn (Nehls) Cooper (Correa)	Joyce (OH) (Garbarino)	Sires (Pallone) Suozi (Beyer)
Crawford (Long) Crist	Kahele (Mrvan) Kirkpatrick (Pallone)	Taylor (Fallon) Walorski (Wagner)
(Wasserman Schultz)	Lamborn (Wilson (SC))	Wilson (FL) (Blunt)
Cuellar (Correa) Evans (Mfume)	Lawson (FL) (Wasserman Schultz)	Rochester)
Frankel, Lois (Wasserman Schultz)		

RESILIENT ASSISTANCE FOR MITIGATION FOR ENVIRONMENTALLY
RESILIENT INFRASTRUCTURE
AND CONSTRUCTION BY AMERICANS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5689) to improve the provision of Federal resources to help build capacity and fund risk-reducing, cost-effective mitigation projects for eligible State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments and certain private non-profit organizations, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 383, nays 41, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—383

Adams Aderholt Aguilar Alfred Amodei Armstrong Bourdeaux Bowman Auchincloss Axne Babin Bacon Baird Balderson Banks Barr Barragán Bass Beatty Bentz Bera Bergman Beyer Bice (OK)	Bilirakis Bishop (GA) Blumenauer Blunt Rochester Bonamici Bost Bourdeaux Bowman Boyle, Brendan F. Brady Brown (MD) Brown (OH) Brownley Buchanan Bucshon Budd Burgess Bush Bustos Butterfield Calvert Cammack	Carbajal Cárdenas Carey Carl Carson Carter (GA) Carter (LA) Carter (TX) Cartwright Case Casten Castor (FL) Castro (TX) Chabot Cherfilus- McCormick Chu Cicilline Clark (MA) Clarke (NY) Cleaver Cloud Clyburn
--	--	---

Cohen Cole Comer Connolly Cooper Correa Costa Courtney Craig Crawford Crenshaw Crist Crow Cuellar Curtis Davids (KS) Davis, Danny K. Davis, Rodney Dean DeFazio DeGette DeLauro DelBene Delgado Demings DeSaulnier Deutsch Diaz-Balart Dingell Doggett Donalds Doyle, Michael F. Duncan Dunn Ellzey Escobar Eshoo Espallat Evans Feenstra Ferguson Fischbach Fitzgerald Fitzpatrick Fleischmann Fletcher Foster Foxy Frankel, Lois Franklin, C. Scott Fulcher Gallagher Gallego Garamendi Garbarino Garcia (CA) Garcia (IL) Garcia (TX) Gibbs Gimenez Golden Gomez Gonzales, Tony Gonzalez (OH) Gonzalez, Vicente Gottheimer Granger Graves (LA) Graves (MO) Green (TN) Green, Al (TX) Griffith Grijalva Grothman Guthrie Harder (CA) Hartzler Hayes Hern Herrera Beutler Higgins (LA) Higgins (NY) Hill Himes Hinson Hollingsworth Horsford Houlahan Hoyer Hudson Huffman Huizenga Issa Jackson Lee Jacobs (CA) Jacobs (NY)	Jayapal Jeffries Johnson (GA) Johnson (LA) Johnson (OH) Johnson (SD) Johnson (TX) Jones Joyce (OH) Joyce (PA) Kahele Kaptur Katko Keating Keller Kelly (IL) Kelly (MS) Kelly (PA) Khanna Kildee Kilmer Kim (CA) Kim (NJ) Kind Kinzinger Kirkpatrick Krishnamoorthi Kuster Kustoff LaHood LaMalfa Lamb Langevin Larsen (WA) Larson (CT) Latta LaTurner Lawrence Lawson (FL) Lee (CA) Lee (NV) Leger Fernandez Letlow Levin (CA) Levin (MI) Lieu Lofgren Long Lowenthal Lucas Luetkemeyer Luria Lynch Mace Malinowski Malliotakis Maloney, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Manning Matsui McBath McCarthy McCaul McClain McClintock McCollum McEachin McGovern McHenry McKinley McNerney Meeks Meijer Meng Mfume Miller (WV) Miller-Meeks Moolenaar Mooney Moore (UT) Moore (WI) Morelle Moulton Mrvan Mullin	Omar Owens Palazzo Pallone Palmer Panetta Pappas Pascarell Payne Pence Perlmutter Peters Pfluger Phillips Pingree Pocan Porter Posey Pressley Price (NC) Quigley Raskin Reed Reschenthaler Rice (NY) Rice (SC) Rodgers (WA) Rogers (AL) Rogers (KY) Rose Ross Rouzer Roybal-Allard Ruiz Ruppersberger Rush Rutherford Ryan Salazar Sánchez Sarbanes Scalise Scanlon Schakowsky Schiff Schneider Schradler Schrier Scott (VA) Scott, Austin Sessions Sewell Sherman Sherrill Simpson Sires Slotkin Smith (MO) Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smith (WA) Smucker Soto Spanberger Spartz Speier Stansbury Stanton Stauber Steel Stefanik Steil Stevens Stewart Strickland Suozi Swalwell Takano Tenney Thompson (CA) Thompson (MS) Thompson (PA) Timmons Titus Tlaib Tonko Torres (CA) Torres (NY) Trahan Trone Turner Underwood Upton Valadao Van Drew Van Dyne Vargas Veasey
--	---	---

□ 1542

Messrs. LONG and JACOBS of New York changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters

Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild

Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NAYS—41

Allen
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Brooks
Buck
Burchett
Cawthorn
Cline
Clyde
Davidson
DesJarlais
Estes
Fallon

NOT VOTING—5

Cheney
Emmer

Guest
Hice (GA)
Meuser

□ 1551

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Barragán
(Correa)
Brown (MD)
(Trone)
Cárdenas
(Gomez)
Carter (LA)
(Blunt)
Rochester)
Castro (TX)
(Correa)
Cawthorn (Nehls)
Cooper (Correa)
Crawford (Long)
Crist
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Cuellar (Correa)
Evans (Mfume)
Frankel, Lois
(Wasserman
Schultz)

Fulcher (Meuser)
Gonzalez (OH)
(Kinzinger)
Gosar (Gaetz)
Harder (CA)
(Gomez)
Hartzler
(DesJarlais)
Huffman
(Stanton)
Johnson (TX)
(Jeffries)
Joyce (OH)
(Garbarino)
Kahale (Mrvan)
Kirkpatrick
(Pallone)
Lamborn (Wilson
(SC))
Lawson (FL)
(Wasserman
Schultz)

Mace (Timmons)
McHenry
(Wagner)
Porter (Wexton)
Price (NC)
(Butterfield)
Roybal-Allard
(Pallone)
Schakowsky
(Garcia (IL))
Scott, David
(Jeffries)
Sires (Pallone)
Suozzi (Beyer)
Taylor (Fallon)
Walorski
(Wagner)
Wilson (FL)
(Blunt
Rochester)

SMALL PROJECT EFFICIENT AND
EFFECTIVE DISASTER RECOVER-
ERY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5641) to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to increase the threshold for eligibility for assistance under sections 403, 406, 407, and 502 of such Act, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 11, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—414

Adams
Aderholt
Aguiar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady
Brooks
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette

DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Bera
Españillat
Estes
Evans
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Foster
Fox
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hayes
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)

Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Oberholte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pannetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Ross
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar

NAYS—11

Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Casten
Davidson

Garcia (TX)
Greene (GA)
Massie
Miller (IL)

Norman
Rosendale
Roy

NOT VOTING—4

Bass
Cheney

Guest
Hice (GA)

□ 1600

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Barragán
(Correa)
Brown (MD)
(Trone)
Cárdenas
(Gomez)
Carter (LA)
(Blunt)
Rochester)
Castro (TX)
(Correa)
Cawthorn (Nehls)
Cooper (Correa)
Crawford (Long)
Crist
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Cuellar (Correa)
Evans (Mfume)
Frankel, Lois
(Wasserman
Schultz)

Fulcher (Meuser)
Gonzalez (OH)
(Kinzinger)
Gosar (Gaetz)
Harder (CA)
(Gomez)
Hartzler
(DesJarlais)
Huffman
(Stanton)
Johnson (TX)
(Jeffries)
Joyce (OH)
(Garbarino)
Kahale (Mrvan)
Kirkpatrick
(Pallone)
Lamborn (Wilson
(SC))
Lawson (FL)
(Wasserman
Schultz)

Mace (Timmons)
McHenry
(Wagner)
Porter (Wexton)
Price (NC)
(Butterfield)
Roybal-Allard
(Pallone)
Schakowsky
(Garcia (IL))
Scott, David
(Jeffries)
Sires (Pallone)
Suozzi (Beyer)
Taylor (Fallon)
Walorski
(Wagner)
Wilson (FL)
(Blunt
Rochester)

UPHOLDING THE FOUNDING DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND ESTABLISHING A CENTER FOR DEMOCRATIC RESILIENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 831) calling on the United States Government to uphold the founding democratic principles of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and establish a Center for Democratic Resilience within the headquarters of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 362, nays 63, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—362

Adams	Castro (TX)	Fitzgerald
Aguilar	Chabot	Fitzpatrick
Alfred	Cherfilus	Fleischmann
Amodei	McCormick	Fletcher
Armstrong	Chu	Foster
Arrington	Cicilline	Fox
Auchincloss	Clark (MA)	Frankel, Lois
Axne	Clarke (NY)	Franklin, C.
Bacon	Cleaver	Scott
Baird	Clyburn	Gallagher
Balderson	Cohen	Galleo
Banks	Cole	Garamendi
Barr	Comer	Garbarino
Barragán	Connolly	Garcia (CA)
Bass	Cooper	Garcia (IL)
Beatty	Correa	Garcia (TX)
Bentz	Costa	Gibbs
Bera	Courtney	Gimenez
Bergman	Craig	Golden
Beyer	Crawford	Gomez
Bice (OK)	Crenshaw	Gonzales, Tony
Bilirakis	Crist	Gonzalez (OH)
Bishop (GA)	Crow	Gonzalez,
Blumenauer	Cuellar	Vicente
Blunt Rochester	Curtis	Gottheimer
Bonamici	Davidson (KS)	Graves (LA)
Bost	Davis, Danny K.	Graves (MO)
Bourdeaux	Davis, Rodney	Green, Al (TX)
Bowman	Dean	Griffith
Boyle, Brendan	DeFazio	Grijalva
F.	DeGette	Grothman
Brady	DeLauro	Guthrie
Brooks	DelBene	Harder (CA)
Brown (MD)	Delgado	Hartzler
Brown (OH)	Demings	Hayes
Brownley	DeSaulnier	Herrera Beutler
Buchanan	Deutch	Higgins (NY)
Bucshon	Diaz-Balart	Hill
Budd	Dingell	Himes
Bush	Doggett	Hinson
Bustos	Doyle, Michael	Horsford
Butterfield	F.	Houlihan
Calvert	Duncan	Hoyer
Carbajal	Dunn	Hudson
Cárdenas	Ellzey	Huffman
Carey	Emmer	Huizenga
Carl	Escobar	Issa
Carson	Eshoo	Jackson
Carter (GA)	Españolat	Jackson Lee
Carter (LA)	Evans	Jacobs (CA)
Cartwright	Fallon	Jacobs (NY)
Case	Feenstra	Jayapal
Casten	Ferguson	Jeffries
Castor (FL)	Fischbach	Johnson (GA)

Johnson (LA)	Meng	Schweikert
Johnson (OH)	Meuser	Scott (VA)
Johnson (SD)	Mfume	Scott, Austin
Johnson (TX)	Miller (WV)	Scott, David
Jones	Miller-Meeks	Sewell
Joyce (OH)	Mooney	Sherman
Joyce (PA)	Moore (AL)	Sherrill
Kahele	Moore (UT)	Simpson
Kaptur	Moore (WI)	Sires
Katko	Morelle	Slotkin
Keating	Moulton	Smith (NE)
Kelly (IL)	Mrvan	Smith (WA)
Kelly (MS)	Murphy (FL)	Smucker
Kelly (PA)	Nadler	Soto
Khanna	Napolitano	Spanberger
Kildee	Neal	Spartz
Kilmer	Neguse	Speier
Kim (CA)	Newhouse	Stansbury
Kim (NJ)	Newman	Stanton
Kind	Norcross	Stauber
Kinzinger	O'Halleran	Steel
Kirkpatrick	Obermole	Stefanik
Krishnamoorthi	Ocasio-Cortez	Steil
Kuster	Omar	Stevens
Kustoff	Owens	Stewart
LaHood	Palazzo	Strickland
Lamb	Pallone	Suozzi
Lamborn	Palmer	Swalwell
Langevin	Panetta	Takano
Larsen (WA)	Pappas	Taylor
Larson (CT)	Pascarell	Tenney
Latta	Payne	Thompson (CA)
LaTurner	Pence	Thompson (MS)
Lawrence	Perlmutter	Thompson (PA)
Lawson (FL)	Peters	Timmons
Lee (CA)	Pfenger	Titus
Lee (NV)	Phillips	Tlaib
Leger Fernandez	Pingree	Tonko
Letlow	Pocan	Torres (CA)
Levin (CA)	Porter	Torres (NY)
Levin (MI)	Pressley	Trahan
Lieu	Price (NC)	Trone
Lofgren	Quigley	Turner
Lowenthal	Raskin	Underwood
Lucas	Reed	Upton
Luetkemeyer	Reschenthaler	Valadao
Luria	Rice (NY)	Van Duyne
Lynch	Rice (SC)	Vargas
Mace	Rodgers (WA)	Veasey
Malinowski	Rogers (AL)	Velázquez
Malliotakis	Rogers (KY)	Wagner
Maloney,	Ross	Walorski
Carolyn B.	Rouzer	Waltz
Mann	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Manning	Ruiz	Schultz
Matsui	Ruppersberger	Waters
McBath	Rush	Watson Coleman
McCarthy	Rutherford	Welch
McCaul	Ryan	Westerman
McClain	Salazar	Wexton
McClintock	Sánchez	Wild
McCollum	Sarbanes	Williams (GA)
McEachin	Scalise	Williams (TX)
McGovern	Scanlon	Wilson (FL)
McHenry	Schakowsky	Wilson (SC)
McKinley	Schiff	Wittman
McNerney	Schneider	Womack
Meeks	Schrader	Yarmuth
Meijer	Schrier	Zeldin

NAYS—63

Aderholt	Gohmert	Miller (IL)
Allen	Good (VA)	Moolenaar
Babin	Gooden (TX)	Mullin
Biggs	Gosar	Murphy (NC)
Bishop (NC)	Granger	Nehls
Boebert	Green (TN)	Norman
Buck	Greene (GA)	Perry
Burchett	Harris	Posey
Burgess	Harshbarger	Rose
Cammack	Hern	Rosendale
Carter (TX)	Herrell	Roy
Cawthorn	Higgins (LA)	Sessions
Cline	Hollingsworth	Smith (MO)
Cloud	Jordan	Smith (NJ)
Clyde	Keller	Steube
Davidson	LaMalfa	Tiffany
DesJarlais	Lesko	Van Drew
Donalds	Long	Walberg
Estes	Loudermilk	Weber (TX)
Fulcher	Massie	Webster (FL)
Gaetz	Mass	Wenstrup

NOT VOTING—4

Cheney	Hice (GA)
Guest	Maloney, Sean

□ 1610

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Correa)	Fulcher (Meuser)	Mace (Timmons)
Brown (MD)	Gonzalez (OH)	McHenry
(Trone)	(Kinzinger)	(Wagner)
Cárdenas	Gosar (Gaetz)	Porter (Wexton)
(Gomez)	Harder (CA)	Price (NC)
Carter (LA)	(Gomez)	(Butterfield)
Blunt	Hartzler	Roybal-Allard
(DesJarlais)	(Huffman)	(Pallone)
Rochester)	(Stanton)	Schakowsky
Castro (TX)	Johnson (TX)	(Garcia (IL))
(Correa)	(Jeffries)	Scott, David
Cawthorn (Nehls)	Joyce (OH)	(Jeffries)
Cooper (Correa)	(Garbarino)	Sires (Pallone)
Crawford (Long)	Kahele (Mrvan)	Suozzi (Beyer)
Crist	Kirkpatrick (Pallone)	Taylor (Fallon)
(Wasserman Schultz)	Lamborn (Wilson (SC))	Walorski
Cuellar (Correa)	Lawson (FL)	(Wagner)
Evans (Mfume)	(Wasserman Schultz)	Wilson (FL)
Frankel, Lois		(Blunt)
(Wasserman Schultz)		Rochester)

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3807

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 3807.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES of New York). The gentleman's request is accepted.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3807

Mr. HERN. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 3807.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request is accepted.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3807

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 3807.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's request is accepted.

GREAT LAKES ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ADMINISTRATOR

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the bipartisan Great Lakes Task Force, I rise today to urge the swift appointment of a permanent administrator to lead the Great Lakes St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

The Great Lakes St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is the Federal entity responsible for operating and maintaining the U.S. portions of the Great Lakes St. Lawrence

Seaway. This 370-mile-long commercial channel runs from the Great Lakes, America's fourth seacoast, to the Atlantic Ocean, and then connects our ports with markets around the world.

With 40 million tons of industrial and agricultural cargo traversing the seaway each year, it is time to appoint an administrator, and especially in a time of war. We could be backfilling cargoes to Europe right now.

It is time to fill this vital position, and I look forward to a nominee who understands the needs of our region and is ready to partner with the communities, workers, and businesses of America's industrial and agricultural heartland.

□ 1615

CELEBRATING STEWART CANDY COMPANY'S CENTENNIAL

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Stewart Candy Company's 100th anniversary.

Founded in 1922 by James Ernest Stewart in Waycross, Georgia, the Stewart Candy Company has grown into a multimillion-dollar candy business that distributes their products nationwide.

From its humble beginnings, when Ernest would package his candies in cigar boxes and deliver them in his Model T, to a massive company that sells candies with the click of a button, 100 years is truly worth celebrating.

After Ernest's son, James, graduated from the University of Georgia and served 3 years in the United States Army, he came home to work at the family business.

James, better known as Papa, molded and fashioned Stewart Candies into a modernized business production fit for the next generation of the Stewart family. Four of Papa's six children came to work for the company and organized the Stewart Distribution company, a new division of the candy company.

Jump to today, and Stewart Candy Company is still making their pure sugar soft peppermints in many different flavors, such as banana pudding, key lime, and cinnamon.

The company has gone from just 3 employees to 240 employees and works every day to spread the joy of their candies to every American.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK

(Ms. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Library Week.

Libraries are the cornerstone of our communities. They provide access to knowledge and services. They expose us to ideas and information that help us better understand ourselves, each other, and the world around us. They connect our children to literature, media, and tutoring services. During the pandemic, they have played a critical role in ensuring access to the internet and technology.

I am so grateful for the exceptional libraries in my district, from the Cuyahoga County Public Library and the Cleveland Public Library to the Akron-Summit County Public Library, and all the libraries in between. I am grateful for their dedicated library workers who support northeast Ohioans from all walks of life.

This National Library Week, I thank our libraries and librarians for all they do to support an informed, connected community. I urge my colleagues to support robust funding for these centers of learning and opportunity.

JUDGE JACKSON WILL BE A RUBBER STAMP FOR BIDEN AGENDA

(Mr. ROSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, since before taking office, President Biden and his far-left base have openly expressed their interest in expanding the Supreme Court to create a super-legislature filled with unelected, liberal Justices determined to do the job of Congress and legislate from the bench.

After watching the nomination proceedings, I have no doubt that Judge Jackson will be exactly that, a rubber stamp for President Biden's agenda, not an impartial Justice who interprets the Constitution how it is written.

I believe Judge Jackson's repeated leniency in Federal sentencing cases toward prisoners in Guantanamo Bay, child sex offenders, and convicted criminal drug traffickers gives us a window into her activist judicial philosophy and renders her unsuitable to serve on the highest court.

On behalf of my neighbors in middle Tennessee, I urge both of our Tennessee Senators to vote "no" on confirming Judge Jackson.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ISIDORE "TEDDY" BERTONE

(Ms. MALLIOTAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to tell the Nation about the service of a World War II veteran, someone who became a friend of mine, Isidore Bertone, who on Staten Island we know as Teddy.

He was born on September 13, 1925, in Castiglione, a small village in Sicily. Teddy came to the United States with

his mother in 1937 to escape the fascist regime of Mussolini, who was recruiting teenagers into service.

In October 1943, at the age of 18, Bertone volunteered for the U.S. Navy during World War II. He served with distinction for 2½ years aboard the USS *Zircon* as part of the crew that rescued American sailors in the accidental sinking of an ammo ship off Boston Harbor during the D-day invasion of Normandy.

I first met Teddy after he wrote a letter to the editor on August 21, 2020, pleading for assistance after his request for help with proving his U.S. citizenship went unanswered. Having his citizenship paper was the most important thing to him because he loved this country so much.

I called President Trump's office, and within 4 days, on August 25, 2020, the citizenship office was in his backyard, swearing him in just weeks shy of his 95th birthday. To me, seeing this World War II veteran at the age of 95 being sworn in as an American citizen, was the most beautiful thing I ever witnessed.

Sadly, Teddy passed away on March 19, 2022, at the age of 96.

We miss you, Teddy. We all remember your service, and you are a hero to so many of us on Staten Island and across the United States.

REMEMBERING ROBERT "BOB" FOOTE

(Mr. MANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the memory of Bob Foote, a tremendous Kansan who passed away on March 25.

Bob was a man of many talents. He built one of the largest cattle operations in America, feeding 550,000 head a year and employing 400.

He and his wife, Gail, also built an amazing family who will carry on his legacy and lead Foote Cattle Company into the future.

Bob had tenacity, grit, and confidence. He wasn't afraid to embrace an aggressive approach to business. His motto was "Get It," which he would say to remind those around him to never give up and keep pushing forward.

Bob was a staunch conservative who would often be found giving one of his trademark Bob Foote lectures on politics. He was a true patriot. Most importantly, now that he has gone into Heaven, he was a man of great faith.

From the farm and headquarters in eastern Kansas to ranchland in the Flint Hills and feed yards in western Kansas, I am hard-pressed to think of any ag producer who had such an impact on Kansas agriculture.

Whether he was buying cattle or sharing his faith and work ethic with his grandchildren, Bob believed that he should use the talents that God gave

him to be the best man that he could possibly be.

He is now able to reunite with his beloved Colleen and, together, watch over his legacy, the Foote Cattle Company, and gaze proudly on his beloved Gail and his sons, Scott, Brad, and Greg, as they continue to lead the industry and Kansas agriculture forward.

Bob Foote, may you rest in peace.

CONGRATULATING SOUTH CAROLINA GAMECOCKS WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM ON NCAA NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

(Mr. RICE of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and honor today to congratulate the University of South Carolina women's basketball team on winning the NCAA National Championship. It is a great day to be a Gamecock.

After a heartbreaking loss in the Final Four last year, South Carolina found redemption Sunday night, earning the program's second national championship title with a 64-49 victory over second seed UConn.

The Gamecock women's basketball team had an incredible season with a 35-2 record, averaging 70 points a game.

While every member of the team played their hearts out, Aliyah Boston, the Southeastern Conference Player of the Year, won the Final Four Most Outstanding Player award. She is the first South Carolina player to earn that honor since A'ja Wilson in 2017.

Coach Dawn Staley had an incredible season. Hard work breeds success, and this team is a prime example of that. The national title is a win for South Carolina and every fan who helped cheer them to victory.

Congratulations, Gamecocks, on being the national champions once again.

WALK THROUGH INFLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, one more time, I am going to do something that is a little difficult, and I apologize for you being the poor person in the chair when we do this. I am going to walk through inflation.

I don't think we understand the damage, the economic violence, that is happening to the poor, the working poor, and the economic future of the country.

Sorry, guys, the Democrats get the blame on this one.

We are going to walk through the facts, the mechanisms, but also maybe a couple of solutions.

This is going to be a tough one. So if you like economics, stay tuned. If you

don't like math and economics, I suggest you get away from this presentation as fast as possible.

Also, another weird aside because I get this question all the time: The Chamber is empty, but we are probably on 1,000 televisions throughout the campus here in the House and the Senate, with staff and Members, and that is, in many ways, partially who we are communicating with to think differently.

First off, 1 year ago, I think it was March 21, 2021, the Democrats did one of their huge stimulus bills. Not a single Republican voted for it. That is the moment you can track the explosion in inflation.

I am stealing Larry Summers' quote from one of his presentations a couple of days ago. There was a piling of dry kindling, and the Democrats decided to take a kerosene-soaked log, light it on fire, throw it on that kindling, and boom. Now, we are having a number of our economists saying we may have inflation for an entire decade. This is not transitory.

Do you remember over and over and over when Treasury Secretary Yellen—who I used to have amazing respect for, but now she has become a partisan—would say to us, oh, it is transitory. A number of the Democratic economists would say it is transitory. They are no longer saying that. They basically admitted they screwed up, and a lot of people are getting hurt right now.

I am going to show over and over, if you are a middle-class person, if you are part of the working poor, you are poorer today than 14 months ago when the Democrats took power.

Let's have a little bit of amusement here. You may all remember this. This is from before the stimulus bill, from a year ago. Larry Summers, not a big Republican—come on, Larry Summers has classically always been one of the left's favorite economists, except when he told them: Don't do this. Don't do this. You already have pumped so much cash into the system.

□ 1630

Remember, Mr. Speaker, the world is sort of split. The left believes in sort of a Keynesian model of consumption economics. The right sort of believes in productivity: make more things. It is referred to as supply side. They decided to stimulate consumption and hand out lots of money, and now you are poorer today than you were a year ago, Mr. Speaker. The left's own sort of biggest voice, Larry Summers, basically begged them not to do it. But there is a policy around here: buy your votes and spend lots of taxpayer money. Even today, The Wall Street Journal has an editorial featuring many of the comments from Larry Summers talking about how he expects actually a pretty severe recession now.

We are going to pay a price for my brothers and sisters on the left basically failing their basic economics class. So let's actually walk through it.

Here is basically the chart, Mr. Speaker, and you can see the inflationary expectations when the Democrats took power, when they actually passed their big stimulus bill, and off to the races.

My community in January had a 10.9 percent year-over-year inflation. Some of our models right now say that this month and next month we are actually going to be having inflationary spikes.

I need you to have a concept. So everyone is fretting right now: Oh, the Federal Reserve is going to raise interest rates. It is 2 percent. They might actually go one-half of 1 percent. Mr. Speaker, if you go back to the early, early eighties and the Paul Volcker time, they had to raise the Federal funds rate equal to inflation.

If today the actual inflation rate as of this moment is not 6 percent but closer to 8, 8.1, are you ready for a Federal funds rate at 8?

Because that is what it takes. Because understand, Mr. Speaker, if you are borrowing money today at a Federal funds rate of 2, 2½, and inflation really is closer to 8, there a huge, huge gap. Those need to actually be in alignment because you have a negative actual interest rate. When you are borrowing below what inflation is costing, if the dollar goes to this value every day and you are paying this, you have substantial negative interest rates.

What do you think is going to happen?

So back to the reality. This is what we have done. Actually, I take that back. We didn't do this. The Republicans didn't do it. The Democrats did it, and they did it without a single—without a single—Republican vote.

This line, functionally, is your income, Mr. Speaker, and, yes, it has had a little bit of movement up, but this is your purchasing power because your income has become worth less. In January when we got the 2021 basic data, the mean in our country was about 2½ percent poorer. Their purchasing power, they became poorer.

Inflation has only increased since then.

The reality of it is that really bad economics end up hurting people. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, it is this White House saying—in an absolutely almost laughable—well, it is Putin's inflation. Of course, it was going on long before Putin invaded Ukraine.

Well, it is the Big Oil companies. Except it was Democrat policies that created the natural gas shortages last year.

They are desperate to run away from the responsibility of what they have done.

It is not part of this board deck, but, repeatedly, I have come to this floor and tried to walk through what the two things are, if you want to kick the working poor's head in economically; what do you do?

Well, inflation, right?

Here is another article right now from The Washington Post—a truly conservative publication—“Fed official: Inflation falls hardest on poorer families.”

So the excuse of saying: Well, inflation really wasn't hurting the poor. I mean, come on. We are back to reality. You are killing and you are crushing, economically, the poor.

So number one is inflation. Number two, if you actually look at the data on those folks we put in that category of the working poor, they are individuals who often didn't finish high school or they didn't go to college. They sell their labor.

Do what the left has done this last year: open up the border. Have millions—millions—of people cross the border and come into the country who offer similar skill sets where their economic value is they are going to sell their labor. And now you take the population we love and care about, but we are crushing that working poor, and say, Hey, you now get to compete with a couple of million new residents who are going to sell their labor.

The policy of the last 14 months has just been brutal. You see it in the budget data, Mr. Speaker. Income inequality has gotten worse since the Democrats have taken charge. Food insecurity has gotten worse. Minority populations' incredible gains that happened in 2018, 2019, and the first quarter of 2020 before the pandemic have been lost.

So if you actually care, Mr. Speaker, if you say, I care about economic growth, economic growth is moral, then would you keep doing policies that keep hurting people?

It is math. At some point I would be elated if the left said: Okay, they accept that their model doesn't work and basically has never worked, and instead of spending massive amounts of money—we are going to talk about the danger the country is now in because of the incredible levels of spending and how fragile. There is this fragility concept of interest rates and debt we are going to walk through in a bit.

If the Democrats really cared, they would basically steal the supply-side economics, call it their own—they have done that before on other things—and say, We care about poor people. We are actually going to help them.

But you can't do it this way. Every single day the Democrats have had absolute control, people have gotten poorer.

Once again, there was one Democrat that voted "no," so I will give that person credit. Zero Republicans voted "yes," but 220, 211 voting "no." This is what they called the American Rescue Plan, except now we need to be rescued from the Democrats' American Rescue Plan.

Some of these slides are going to get a little thick.

Purchasing power of \$100—we talk about inflation, but most people don't really process what it means. So let's actually pretend that the baseline inflation that we believe we are at this last quarter, about 7.4, if you had that for 10 years, so if I gave you \$100 today, Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago what would

the purchasing power of that \$100 be? It, functionally, is about \$40, \$46. You have lost more than half of it. Basically, your value and your wealth got cut in half.

Now, if you are on the rich side, Mr. Speaker, you own lots of real estate and you have lots of assets. With inflation, basically those assets become a hedge. But if you are a young family, if you are someone who is retired, you are living on a pension or you are living on your savings or you are trying to get a family started, every day being able to participate in the American Dream gets harder.

There is a reason inflation is one of the most destructive forces in the world in societies. It is because it is the ultimate spreader of income inequality. Those who have assets basically are indemnified from inflation. But if you don't have a bunch of assets, you are this. That is what happens to you. Your dollar at the current rate of inflation will be cut in half in a decade. This is the result of the policies of this place from the last 14 months.

And now we are seeing models saying that it may not be at 7.4. Some are saying it could be 4 or 5. Now, I am a little more worried. But some of the best experts are now saying that inflation now may be structurally built in for this next decade.

Do you understand the damage that is going to do to the American people?

Just some of the different slides trying to understand what the trajectory is right now. We are basically looking at what was projected to be some of the inflationary trends. The current line, basically, is starting to look at about an 8, 8.4. I actually think this year—remember, last year: Oh, it is transitory. Oh, it is just a seasonal spike. It is a supply chain spike.

Now we see the studies that say: Hey, no, half of the inflation from last year—so if you are my community, 10.9 year over year was policy from this body. It wasn't Federal Reserve; it was policy from this body. The other half: Well, we will call it supply chain.

But then you have to read the rest of the article. It basically breaks down that the stresses in the supply chain were workers, misallocation, those things, that also happened to be substantially related to Federal policy. This is an occasion where the Federal Reserve may be a sinner of keeping interest rates too low too long, but Congress, 1 year ago with their American Rescue Plan—not a single Republican voted for it—decided to throw kerosene and matches when their own Democrat economist, when Larry Summers is saying: Don't do it.

Congratulations. You made America poorer.

Now, there is this concept out there called a wage-price spiral. This is really important to get your head around, Mr. Speaker, because there are those out there who think: Oh, the Federal Reserve will raise interest rates a little bit, some of the container ships will

come in, and the supply chain and everything will be wonderful. That is not the math.

There is this concept of, well, prices went up, so I need to be paid more. But if I need to be paid more, the business, to keep its margins, needs to raise its prices. Well, if they raise their prices, I need to be paid more because the business needs to keep their margins, and I need to be able to afford the goods and services. You start this sort of ratchet, it is referred to as a wage-price spiral, and it becomes an unholy circle where wages and demand make a circle. The firm needs to keep its margins to stay in business, well, then you have higher prices and you have higher inflation, and you chase each other.

One of the only ways economists have to break this is you have two choices: You do a bunch of policies very quickly to spike productivity. Well, that would mean my brothers and sisters on the left will, basically, walk away from their economic theory and say that they just became supply-siders and we are going to do everything we can to make more stuff. Or we go into a recession. A number of economists basically now say that we are heading to recession, and Larry Summers actually thinks it is a pretty tough recession coming.

It is a really miserable, horrible thing to do to people who are just getting out of a pandemic trying to get their lives back together. You hit them with inflation, you flood the borders, you push up crime, you push up fentanyl deaths in my area, and now you are going to run the country into a recession. Yay team.

This is from last week. I am told some of these numbers have actually gotten worse this week, but we didn't have time to print a new board. Citibank basically now says 25 percent chance of a recession before the end of the year. Goldman, they were at 27½ last week. I am told some of these numbers are now up.

Economists like Larry Lindsey, I think, is predicting before the end of this month we will actually start to hit the very first steps of a recessionary cycle.

Now, remember, Mr. Speaker, prices have gone up faster than your wages. So every day you are getting a little bit poorer, then you begin to pull back on your purchases. The model basically says that is what kicks off a recessionary cycle.

□ 1645

Now, in the past, when you did your high school economics class, it was, oh, inventories go up too high and you stop buying stuff and you bleed down your inventories. There is such a thing as an inflationary-driven recessionary cycle, because all of a sudden, you don't have the same purchasing power. You actually saw some of the consumer data hitting last week that, all of a sudden, consumers are starting to change their behavior.

Larry Lindsey may have it right, that these Democrat policies are basically paying off what Larry Summers told you was going to happen. Trust me, I never thought I would be behind this microphone saying Larry Summers got it right.

Now, you actually go into what are some of the other stressors that will make it so inflation doesn't taper off. Remember: What is inflation? It is too many dollars chasing too few goods and services.

So you can slow down, you can crush, you can remove liquidity. You can have the Federal Reserve basically bleed off some its inventory of bonds and other holdings. They can raise interest rates, and that squeezes down the money supply.

Or the other side, you can make more stuff. But it would require our brothers and sisters on the left, who run this place—they run Washington; they have the Presidency; they have the House; they have the Senate—to do things to incentivize our brothers and sisters not to retire early; for young people to get into the workforce; for some of the populations that, you know, it is dystopian policies of COVID where we forced so many working families and working moms out of the labor force after those miracle years of 2018, 2019, first quarter of 2020, where we saw wages, particularly for women of color, just miraculous numbers.

Then comes the policy of shutting down the schools, shutting down the economy. Those are the populations who you can see have just been crushed. Unless we get back to levels of participating in the economy, you can't get the productivity.

So, could you and I come together, as people on left and the right, and say we are going to incentivize our brothers and sisters who may have chosen to retire to come back in? We are going to incentivize individuals to come back into the labor force because we need to make more stuff. This is not complicated economics. It is just a lot of complicated decisions, and it will require the left, basically, to walk away from some of their orthodoxy.

The other thing—I show this slide just to point out what is happening demographically. It is also an opportunity, but it is also really tough. We actually have a situation here, if you look where we are at, you come to the 10-year marks, so at the end of the decade, we, functionally, are heading at parts where 20, 22 percent—actually, I think 22 percent of the population at the end of the decade are 65 and older.

What are the leverages we would have here in Congress to encourage those individuals to stay in the labor force? We have already done some things in regard to the Social Security tax penalties, but could we do more of that? If this is about a labor shortage that is also going to continue the inflationary cycle and you have the choice of making people poorer by shoving us into a recession or making more stuff,

what are the levers you can pull to incentivize capital investments by businesses and organizations and then our brothers and sisters get into or come back into the labor force.

There are also other reasons, and this does tie together. You understand how fragile—this is a basic chart showing how soon Social Security and the Medicare part A trust fund—most of Medicare is actually a general fund expenditures. The hospital portion, what we call part A, is in a trust fund, and they are out of money. By 2027, Medicare part A is modeled to be empty, and this number is actually sooner because of what we did last year. This board was printed last year.

The Social Security trust fund is out of money, I think, in 2032 or 2031, it may be our best guess now. If we have more of our brothers and sisters in the labor force, these numbers go out, if you have productivity. But there is a small problem. As inflation kicks off and the COLA mechanisms and Medicare healthcare costs keep going up, we are not absolutely sure what happens if we don't get more labor force participation, more people in the economy working.

All the costs here, these numbers, these bankruptcies, running out of money, Social Security and Medicare part A may be happening a lot sooner.

So the brain trust around here has this idea that says, hey, let's take the Medicare benefit age and instead of making it 65, let's make it 60, because that way we can have the bankruptcy of it happen much sooner. It is good politics; it is great virtue-signaling from the speechifying. It may be good at getting reelected, but it is horrible economics.

To understand how bad the economics have been, this is a slide I made last year, at the end of last year, to understand what 2021 was like from a fiscal standpoint.

The punch line, when you look at all of these numbers, is we were borrowing over \$47,000 every second. Every second we were borrowing \$47,000. You wonder why we kicked off inflation—excuse me—they kicked off inflation? You also wonder why your country, from a financial standpoint, is so fragile.

I am going to show you a slide here at the end. It is basically the punch line at the end, that if the 2 points higher interest rate holds for a couple decades, at the end of those decades, every dime of revenue, receipts, into the Federal Government just covers interest costs.

Does anyone around here own a calculator? Don't give me, oh, we need more tax receipts, because the fact of the matter, post tax reform, you had number 2 and number 3 highest revenue years in U.S. history, adjusted for inflation, real receipts adjusted for inflation. You are going to notice, even last year was the highest highest ever. And the only reason these two weren't number 1 and number 2 is I think 2014 had a weird timing effect on some paybacks from TARP and some other things.

The folks here don't tell the truth about math and say, Oh, you guys did tax reform at the end of 2017. Yeah, but we grew the economy at a breakneck pace, the poor got dramatically less poor, and tax receipts came screaming in, particularly from overseas, unlike what was predicted by the left. Oh, it is a giveaway, except we took in a hell of a lot more taxes.

Remember, the new tax code, that we are still under today, was more progressive than the old one. In other words, the rich are paying a higher percentage of Federal income taxes than they were before we did tax reform at the very end of 2017. But that was a supply side type of tax reform, encouraging people to make more stuff, to make the society more productive, to provide more opportunity. It worked. But it wasn't, basically, the giveaway model that the left embraces, and, therefore, they repeatedly lie about it.

Yes, think about this. Even with all the horrible things that went on in 2020, a slight reduction in total tax revenues, receipts; 2021, highest ever. We basically broke through \$4 trillion dollars. Our problem is, we still took that \$4 trillion and then spent a couple trillion on top of that, so we borrowed a couple trillion last year on top of all of the cash that came in through taxes.

With all that borrowing, you start to realize the fraud, the danger. You see this whole section here, that green? That is magic money. That is, functionally, the Federal Reserve buying our debt. So they basically lay a claim on banking deposits, a theoretical claim, and buy it. So when you have \$5 trillion thrown in, do you blame the Federal Reserve or do you blame us, who basically are running these massive deficits and debt?

Look, the Federal Reserve is like the family member of an alcoholic family that keeps buying them beer. They basically have enabled our bad policy decisions. If we had to pay the actual price for a lot of this crazy spending—but by doing what they did here—and the next time you have someone say, Oh, it is Japan, well, Japan is down here. China is there. This is the Federal Reserve, and then this is, functionally, individuals.

I am going to show some of the slides that really worry me of what is the appetite for people to basically buy a U.S. bond to help us keep financing this crazy debt and deficits and the fact that every day the bond is actually worth less money.

If you go by a 10-year bond today—and I think the post I saw just before I came in here, it was sitting at about 2.5. If it is true that at this moment, inflation may be running somewhere from 6 to 8 percent, how much are you losing every single day in your value? People are loaning the money and taking a negative rate of return. That isn't going to go on long. That is when you hear this discussion of inverted yield curves.

I was going to do a whole presentation on yield curves, and the staff,

basically, looked at me in terror, so I am not going to do that to you.

Just basically understand, when you hear the term “inverted,” it basically says, theoretically, if I loan you money on a short-term, I should be willing to take a lower interest rate, because there is less risk than if I loan you money longer. I should ask for a little bit more premium, because more bad things, more unknowns, more black swans can happen.

When it inverts, it basically says: I expect something bad in the short term, but eventually it will work itself out, so I am willing to give you longer-term money at a better yield or at a better price.

The yield curve has, right now, two things that should send you some very weird messages. The short term is inverted and then comes back and inverts. But at the end of the curve, longer term, you start to see people are getting very worried about those 20 years, 30 years of long-term U.S. debt. You are starting to see it in the actual pricing of our debt, and that should be signaling you some very scary messages.

A chart like this—and I am not even sure it is completely accurate yet. I think the numbers are actually worse. We are right here. We are, functionally, now working on the 2023 budget, and they are basically trying to tell you: Hey, be prepared; we are going to be well over a trillion dollars a year. Eight budget years from now, just the interest cost is a trillion bucks. That is assuming the CBO’s baseline interest rate that is nowhere near high enough.

So we were already heading, at the end of this decade, to trillion-dollar-a-year just borrowing cost. That was just the interest. Remember, it is not what we borrow today; it is what we borrow today and all of the other debt that has to be refinanced. Because when the bond that was sold 10 years ago comes due, we don’t pay it off. We just sell more debt and refinance it.

If you have a \$100 billion option of new debt, new borrowing, because of our incredible spending, there may be another \$200 or \$300 billion on top of that, that’s what we call the roll, the weighted daily average.

□ 1700

Just have that in your head. Functionally, in 8 years, interest—interest—is a trillion dollars a year. And the hits keep getting worse. This is before the craziness of the spending.

This board was printed, I think, in 2021, so it missed trillions of dollars of additional borrowing and spending. We were already scheduled to borrow \$112 trillion of running debt in today’s dollars in 29 years. Three-quarters of it was Medicare, functionally, one-quarter of it was Social Security. The rest of the budget is substantially in balance.

Inflation now is about to drive medical costs up, and inflation actually changes the COLA of Social Security.

These numbers get dramatically worse. But there is a scam here. I am going to do my best to try to explain this. You are retired. You have savings. You are getting your Medicare, your Social Security. But your savings, as this inflation continues, every day is worth a little less money.

You hear the term, eating away at your value. If inflation is eating away at your value, where does that value go? It basically goes to this side of the ledger. When you are paying back those bonds, that debt, you are paying it back now with less valuable dollars. It is basically a transfer from everyone that saved, particularly our retired population.

Remember, at the end of the decade, 22 percent of the population is 65 or older. The population that has saved, they become poorer, and that money is transferred to being able to pay back our debt. But now you get to pay it back with inflated dollars. It’s a secret backdoor way to strip savers, older Americans of their wealth, and move it to pay back the crazy amounts of borrowing that are going on.

So now we structurally will also make—it really affects our retired population; they get poorer. But it is also a way to pay back the amazing amount of debt with what you call inflated dollars, less valuable dollars, and it is a wink-wink-nod-nod.

There are some economists, particularly here in Washington, who will actually say, Don’t say it out loud, SCHWEIKERT; but we almost need to do this because there is no way this body is capable of doing the policies that would create the level of growth and economic participation that would raise everyone’s wealth, everyone’s prosperity, and, therefore, the tax receipts and the less need for social entitlements and social transfer programs.

We can do really good policy for really good economics, or we can just inflate our way out of part of the crushing debt, and it looks like Democrat policies have decided we are going to inflate our way because that is what has happened here. That is the decision that has been made.

This chart is a little hard to get our head around, but what is important about it is to get our sense of how fast, since January ‘21, the levels of borrowing through the Federal Reserve are going. This one basically says since January ‘21 there has been another \$2, \$2½ trillion of transfer from Federal Reserve absorbing U.S. sovereign debt. Basically, they are creating magic money to help us keep financing our spending. That is also money because of our fiscal decisions.

Inflation didn’t come out of nowhere. This is the third time I am going to say it. Even Democrat economists were warning the majority here that this was coming, and you decided to kick Americans in the head.

So, think about this: President Biden, Speaker PELOSI made a decision, and so far in President Biden’s term

we, functionally, have well over \$2½ trillion of additional debt piled on. It is a remarkable record. In a time when we were coming out of the COVID dystopia, we piled on another \$2½ trillion plus created all sorts of other unfunded liabilities.

The next slide is really important to get our heads around. There is this concept of fragility. If it is true, we may be heading into not just—because we all agree the fraud of saying the inflation is transitory, okay, that con job has now come to an end. Now, the left is going to try to say, well, it is Putin’s inflation, it is Big Oil inflation. Americans aren’t stupid.

I am particularly blessed, I represent one of the best-educated districts in all of America, so I have freaky smart people in my Phoenix-Scottsdale district, and they get this. But there is this concept of fragility. What happens to the country if interest rates are just a bit higher than we have modeled? Do you have a sense of what happens?

This board is from a year ago when we did the math. If interest rates are just 2 points, 2 percent—which is already happening—2 percent higher than CBO’s baseline, Congressional Budget Office’s baseline, functionally, in 29 years, every dollar of tax receipts, tax income, however you want to call it—in Ways and Means we call it receipts—every dollar just pays the interest bill. It buys nothing. There is no more money for education, space travel; there is no more money for Medicare, Medicaid; there is no more money because all we are paying is interest.

This is the fragility. This is how dangerous you have made this country’s economics by borrowing so much money and then screwing up the economics.

My point of this 45 minutes of rambling: Inflation—very, very dangerous. There are policy decisions. Those policy decisions will require the Democrats to walk away from their orthodoxy. They will have to admit they have been worshipping a false economics god and join us in doing things that are, actually, good for society, good for poor people, good for the working poor, good for the middle class.

And then, dear God, hopefully we are not too late, because if Larry Summers is correct that we are actually going to go into a pretty harsh recession, you want to kick people in the head; you want to destroy the middle class; you want to make it so it takes years to get back to normality; and now you have economists saying the inflation may be with us for a decade. Even if Republicans take back Congress and then take back the White House, it could be a decade before we repair the damage that this body did in 14 months.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 6, 2022, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-3709. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Virginia; Revision to the Classification and Implementation of the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard for the Northern Virginia Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2021-0606; FRL-9176-02-R3] received March 7, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3710. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 21-051, pursuant to Section 36 (c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3711. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 21-053, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3712. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 21-056, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3713. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 21-036, pursuant to Section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3714. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 21-078, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3715. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 21-081, pursuant to Section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3716. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 21-053, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3717. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Report Number: 004646, pursuant to Sec. 7070 of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2021 (Div. K, P.L. 116-260), as carried forward by the Continuing Appropriations

Act, 2022 (Div. A, P.L. 117-43); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3718. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Report Number: 004615, pursuant to Section 490(b)(1)(A) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ:

H.R. 7393. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to develop an employee recruitment strategy that includes partnering with minority-serving institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Ms. MACE, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 7394. A bill to provide for improvements in the treatment of women in the criminal justice system; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. BASS, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CASTEN, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. PORTER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 7395. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for certain expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself, Mr. PERRY, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. CLYDE):

H.R. 7396. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 to deter labor slowdowns and prohibit labor organizations from blocking modernization efforts at ports of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 7397. A bill to restart oil and gas leasing and permitting on Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 7398. A bill to prohibit wildlife killing contests on public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COMER (for himself and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee):

H.R. 7399. A bill to amend the Land Between the Lakes Protection Act of 1998 to clarify the administration of the Land Between the Lakes National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CRAIG (for herself and Mr. MULLIN):

H.R. 7400. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a demonstration program to test providing preferential treatment under the Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP programs for certain drugs and biologicals manufactured in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 7401. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a program to populate downloadable tax forms with taxpayer return information; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 7402. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from authorizing certain transactions by a United States financial institution in connection with Iran, to prevent the International Monetary Fund from providing financial assistance to Iran, to codify prohibitions on Export-Import Bank financing for the government of Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LATTI (for himself, Mrs. LESKO, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. DONALDS):

H.R. 7403. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out a program to operate a uranium reserve consisting of uranium produced and converted in the United States and a program to ensure the availability of uranium produced, converted, and enriched in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. MAST, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia):

H.R. 7404. A bill to clarify the authority of the President to declare certain national emergencies under the National Emergencies Act, certain major disasters or emergencies under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, or public health emergencies under the Public Health Service Act on the premise of climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 7405. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation, acting through the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, to amend certain regulations to require all helicopters and rotorcraft to fly at the maximum altitude permitted by the Federal Aviation Administration in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 7406. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to update the definition of supportive services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 7407. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to award Restaurant Revitalization Grants to certain eligible applicants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEIL (for himself and Mr. HUIZENGA):

H.R. 7408. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to update the Commissions' guidance on economic analysis in rulemakings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TORRES of New York (for himself, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 7409. A bill to modify the conditions for the termination of an oversight board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WENSTRUP (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON):

H.R. 7410. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for credits against tax for domestic medical and drug manufacturing and advanced medical manufacturing equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio (for himself, Ms. MACE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 1028. A resolution supporting the current definition of materiality in the securities laws and opposing new disclosure requirements outside the core mission of the Securities and Exchange Commission; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan (for himself and Mr. TRONE):

H. Res. 1029. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of April 4 through April 8, 2022, as National Assistant Principals Week; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H. Res. 1030. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of September 18 through September 24, 2022, as "Gold Star Families Remembrance Week"; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POSEY:

H. Res. 1031. A resolution impeaching Joseph R. Biden, President of the United

States, for high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BACON, and Mr. KIM of New Jersey):

H. Res. 1032. A resolution supporting the designation of April 2022 as the "Month of the Military Child"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ:

H.R. 7393.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 7394.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, providing—"All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 7395.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 7396.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 grants that Congress shall "regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;" Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 grants that "The Congress shall have Power to . . . Make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by [the] Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 7397.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 7398.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. COMER:

H.R. 7399.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 7400.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 for the Commerce Clause

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 7401.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 7402.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses I

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 7403.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Executive the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 7404.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 7405.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 7406.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 7407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution—to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. STEIL:

H.R. 7408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

"To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. TORRES of New York:

H.R. 7409.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 7410.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. CARL.

H.R. 117: Mr. JACOBS of New York.
H.R. 286: Mrs. BOEBERT.
H.R. 471: Mr. BARR and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 515: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.
H.R. 1057: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 1179: Ms. PORTER, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 1226: Mr. MOONEY.
H.R. 1255: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 1282: Ms. WILD and Mr. MELJER.
H.R. 1285: Ms. BARRAGAN.
H.R. 1297: Mr. PASCRELL and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 1332: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1334: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 1352: Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 1481: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 1553: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1756: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 1946: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 2007: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 2100: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.
H.R. 2171: Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 2187: Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 2198: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. CHU, Ms. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2354: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2454: Ms. MENG and Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 2924: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2972: Mr. LUCAS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2974: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CROW, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3355: Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 3461: Ms. STANSBURY and Ms. VAN DUYN.
H.R. 3491: Mr. POSEY and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 3577: Mr. COMER and Mr. MOONEY.
H.R. 3587: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. NEGUSE, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BROWNLEY, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3614: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3753: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.
H.R. 3759: Ms. CRAIG, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. ROSS, and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 3816: Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 3962: Mr. KELLER and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 4390: Mr. FALLON.
H.R. 4410: Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 4568: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 4587: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 5254: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 5394: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 5514: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 5801: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 5802: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. MENG, and Mr. GIMENEZ.
H.R. 5828: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 5874: Mr. DAVIDSON.
H.R. 5905: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5981: Mr. GOODEN of Texas.
H.R. 6000: Mr. CASTEN, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RUSH, Ms. CAS-TOR of Florida, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 6015: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 6132: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Ms. MACE.
H.R. 6161: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 6270: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 6272: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 6299: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 6308: Mrs. MCBATH.
H.R. 6408: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 6608: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. BOWMAN.
H.R. 6613: Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. MORELLE, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 6629: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 6678: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 6699: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 6736: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 6738: Ms. PLASKETT.
H.R. 6825: Ms. MENG, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ALLRED, and Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 6860: Mr. AGUILAR and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 6969: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.
H.R. 7027: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 7051: Mr. HERN and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 7073: Mr. TIMMONS and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 7079: Ms. SANCHEZ.
H.R. 7099: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 7116: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 7144: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 7150: Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. GOOD of Virginia.
H.R. 7185: Ms. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 7222: Mr. MOORE of Utah.
H.R. 7226: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 7236: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 7237: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 7238: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 7260: Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 7272: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 7276: Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 7298: Mr. OBERNOLTE and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 7303: Mr. JACOBS of New York, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. DELGADO, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 7310: Mr. MRVAN.
H.R. 7311: Mr. BERA, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 7337: Mr. RASKIN, Ms. PORTER, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 7359: Mr. RUTHERFORD and Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina.
H.R. 7382: Mr. BEYER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 7385: Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK.
H.R. 7391: Mr. SIRES.
H.J. Res. 46: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.J. Res. 79: Mr. MEIJER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. MULLIN.
H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. SOTO, Mr. JONES, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. CHU, and Ms. ESHOO.
H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. JACKSON, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PALMER, Mr. BENTZ, and Ms. CHENEY.
H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
H. Res. 240: Ms. MENG.
H. Res. 344: Mr. KAHELE.
H. Res. 833: Mr. MELJER and Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 891: Mr. MORELLE.
H. Res. 968: Mr. MASSIE.
H. Res. 1008: Ms. SPEIER.
H. Res. 1009: Ms. LEE of California.
H. Res. 1026: Mr. BUCSHON.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Small Business Committee in H.R. 3807 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3807: Mr. BOST, Mr. HERN, and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 2022

No. 60

Senate

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION TO DISCHARGE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the motion to discharge the Gordon nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Julia Ruth Gordon, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. WARNOCK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now on COVID, yesterday afternoon I announced that Senator ROMNEY and I had reached an agreement for a \$10 billion COVID supplemental appropriations package. It took many rounds of bipartisan talks, many days and nights and weekends of negotiations, but we have shaken hands on a compromise that the Senate can and should move forward very soon.

I thank the Senators on both sides of the aisle who participated in this, and Senators BURR, BLUNT, and GRAHAM were involved with Senator ROMNEY. Senator COONS gets a special shout-out because of his fierce determination to work on international, on getting an international thing done. Senator MURRAY, as well, was very helpful in our negotiations.

The deal we announced yesterday has the support of Speaker PELOSI and President Biden, who urged Congress to work quickly to get a bill to his desk. We are going to work hard to get that done, and I hope my Republican colleagues will join us to move forward on this legislation.

There is no reason why we shouldn't be able to get this funding passed. The administration needs it right now, and we all know that our country is in great need of replenishing our COVID health response funding. Putting in the work, today, to keep our Nation prepared against new variants will make it less likely that we get caught off guard by a new variant down the line.

So this is really essential to America's well-being. It is essential to getting back to normal. All those who decried that we didn't get to normal quickly enough should be supportive of this legislation, because the longer we wait, the more difficult it will be when the next variant hits.

This \$10 billion COVID package will give the Federal Government and our citizens the tools we need—we depend on—to continue our economic recovery, to keep our schools open, to keep American families safe. The package we agreed to will provide billions more for vaccines, more testing capacity, and—essential—\$5 billion for more life-saving therapeutics, arguably the greatest need right now for the country.

These therapeutics are great drugs, but if we don't have them at the ready when the new variant hits, it will let the variant get its tentacles deeper into our society. But this money will go a long way at keeping our schools, our businesses, our churches, our communities running as normally as possible, should a future variant rear its nasty head.

Approving this package is simply the sensible, responsible, and necessary thing to do. Republicans and Democrats alike should now work together

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, listen to our words and hear our sighs. You are our rock of safety. We continue to trust You to protect our Nation and world.

Lord, continue to be our refuge and strength, always ready to hear and answer our prayers. Surround our lawmakers with the blessings of Your grace and mercy. Lead them like a shepherd in their efforts to do Your will on Earth, even as it is done in Heaven. Enable them to permit justice to roll down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.

And, Lord, save the Ukrainian people.

We pray in Your powerful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1949

to make sure we can move this package through the Chamber.

Now, while this funding is absolutely necessary, it is far from perfect. I am deeply disappointed that some of our Republican friends could not agree to include \$5 billion for global response efforts. I pushed them hard to include this international funding, as, of course, did Senator COONS and Senators GRAHAM and ROMNEY because fighting COVID abroad is intrinsically connected to keeping Americans healthy at home.

It is not just the right thing to do to help struggling nations, though we certainly have an obligation to help. It is also good for our country. So it is putting money overseas to prevent COVID from spreading here, because, remember, every variant—all three variants—that hit us started overseas and then came here. So that is not only humanitarian and the moral and right thing to do, but it is in our own self-interest. I know it sometimes sounds anomalous—sending money overseas is in our interest—but with COVID, where it germinates and starts the new variants, inevitably overseas, and then comes to hurt us is the right thing to do in our own self-interest, even if you had no humanitarian interest in doing it, which, of course, many of us do have a great deal of humanitarian interest.

If we don't help the developing nations of the world with vaccines and treatment, we leave ourselves seriously at risk for potential new variants. Omicron, after all, started, in all likelihood, in South Africa, where today less than a third of the population is vaccinated—fully vaccinated.

It is thus my intention for the Senate to consider a bipartisan international appropriations package that will include funding to address COVID-19, as well as other urgent priorities, like aid for Ukraine and funding for global food insecurity.

I know that many on both sides—I mentioned the names earlier—are serious about reaching an agreement on this issue. Nevertheless, this week's agreement is carefully negotiated. We bent over backward when our Republican colleagues did not want to accept certain kinds of pay-fors which we thought were appropriate and have always been used, but we thought it was so important to get this done that we did that. It is a very important step to keeping the country healthy and keeping life as close to normal in the future as we can.

I want to thank, again, Senator ROMNEY for leading the negotiations for the Senate Republicans and working in good faith to reach agreement. I also want to thank, as I mentioned, COONS, MURRAY, BURR, BLUNT, and GRAHAM for their help and support to reach this bipartisan agreement, and Chairman LEAHY and his staff for their assistance in putting the legislation together.

Finally, I want to thank the staff of the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office. They worked around the clock with us to score this legislation.

So we have taken a massive step closer to getting this important funding done, and I thank everyone for their good work to reach this point.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Now, on another happy note, the Judge Jackson confirmation, last night we took our first steps here on the Senate floor toward confirming the historic nomination of Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson to the U.S. Supreme Court. By virtue of a motion to discharge, Judge Jackson's nomination was reported out of the Judiciary Committee—it really wasn't reported out of Judiciary.

By virtue of a motion to discharge, Judge Jackson's nomination was put on the floor by a bipartisan vote of 53–47. She now comes to the floor for consideration by the whole Chamber. Every day we move closer to Judge Jackson's confirmation, the case and likelihood of her confirmation grows stronger and stronger and stronger. And I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have approached this process with good faith. At the end of the day, it will be our courts and the American people who rely on our courts who will benefit most from having an amazing jurist like Judge Jackson elevated to the pinnacle of the Federal judiciary.

Here is what happens next. Later today, I am going to take the next step for moving forward with Judge Jackson's nomination by filing cloture on her. My colleagues should be advised that we may have to take some procedural votes to do so, but this will not affect the ultimate result of this confirmation process.

Once I file cloture, the stage will be set for the Senate to close debate on Judge Jackson's nomination by Thursday morning. A vote on final confirmation will then follow. The Senate could then vote to confirm Judge Jackson as Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson as soon as Thursday—as soon as this Thursday. I hope we can work together and make that happen.

What better way to wrap up this work period—this productive, largely bipartisan work period—than by confirming this most worthy, most qualified, most historic nominee to the Supreme Court?

Yesterday, I said something that I think is worth emphasizing all week long: Judge Jackson's nomination is a joyous and momentous occasion for the Senate. She is truly one of the most qualified and accomplished individuals ever considered by this Chamber to the Supreme Court. She will bring a new and much needed perspective to the Court's work, while also affirming the rule of law and respect for precedent.

As I said yesterday, the confirmation of the Nation's first Black woman to the highest Court in the land will resonate for the rest of our Nation's history. Untold millions of kids will open textbooks and see pictures of Justice Jackson and understand in a new way what it means to move toward a more

perfect Union. It means that all our Nation's struggles, for all the steps forward and steps backward, the long march of our democracy is toward greater opportunity and representation for all.

So when the Senate finishes its work this week, Justice Jackson will be the first of many—the first of many. Her brilliance, her lifetime of hard work, her remarkable story will light a flame of inspiration for the next generation to hopefully chart their own path for serving our democracy and unleash so much talent that has thus far not been utilized. This gives me great hope. That should give all of us great hope.

COMMERCE HEARING

Mr. President, finally, I want to close by thanking my friend and colleague Chairwoman CANTWELL for holding a hearing in the Commerce Committee that is of great importance to the American people: ensuring transparency in petroleum markets. That hearing will occur today.

The American people right now find themselves on the losing side of a truly disturbing trend. On the one hand, the American people are paying more and more at the pump, and some of the Nation's biggest oil companies are reporting soaring profits but then using those profits to reward shareholders with stock buybacks.

This is infuriating. Prices go way up; oil companies make more profit; and what do they use it for? Stock buybacks, which do nothing to improve the economy, improve workers, or help the consumer. It is outrageous, and it is one of the reasons there is such mistrust of the big oil companies.

So I am glad that the Commerce Committee is looking into this important issue, and I urge the FTC to likewise take note.

I thank Chair CANTWELL for her work. I expect that we will see additional announcements on this matter very soon. This caucus—this Democratic caucus—is going to keep its eye out and do whatever we can to help with bringing down the outrageously high price of oil and the outrageous actions of corporate executives in the oil industry.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

INFLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the American people are seriously worried about the direction our economy is headed. Just between January and March, the share of people reporting high living costs as the most important

problem facing our country actually doubled and so did the share of those most worried about the price of gas.

Consumer price hikes have now set new 40-year records multiple months in a row. More and more American families are feeling the pinch. And 7 in 10 say they do not like how President Biden is handling it.

It was clear from the start that the Biden administration's war on affordable energy would punish American consumers, and even liberal economists warned that flooding our economy with partisan spending could trigger broad inflation.

Sure enough, American families have now endured 9 straight months of inflation above a 5-percent annual pace, and the worst effects are being felt in the most vulnerable pockets of our society.

One analysis of spending on household staples found that cost cutting "is most pronounced among lower-income Americans."

As the Washington Post reported, "lower-income workers like [Jacqueline] Rodriguez have seen some of the fastest wage growth of the pandemic era. But those gains are being eroded by the highest inflation in 40 years. . . . 'It's outrageous how much everything has gone up,' Rodriguez said. 'I go to the supermarket to buy chicken, and I have to make a decision on what meal I'm going to cook based on the prices. . . . Everything is more expensive.'"

Another group who especially remain vulnerable are seniors on fixed incomes. One retired teacher in North Carolina recently said it like this:

Just surviving day to day has become a big concern of mine—because, how in the world? . . . I'm starting to panic. I'm starting to think, "How am I going to keep paying for everything?"

Many retirees already face health challenges or other hardships so there is simply no wiggle room in their budgets.

One California man explained that cancer was the reason he had to retire in the first place. Now he is "scraping the bottom of the barrel. . . . I do most of my food shopping in markdown bins and don't buy much else."

One White House official has seemed to endorse the sentiment that inflation is "a high-class problem." A whole lot of low-income Americans and retired Americans could very readily set them straight on that.

Last autumn, the administration's top spokeswoman scoffed at what she called "the tragedy of the treadmill that's delayed."

Well, that may be the extent of the pain that inflation and supply chain problems are causing certain affluent people—people like those inside the beltway having to wait a little extra on luxury purchases—but I can assure the President's team that many Americans are hurting a lot worse than they are.

The very least the administration must do is stop digging; no more reckless spending, no gigantic tax increases

that would damage the economy even further.

Yet Senate Democrats won't give up on yet another reckless spending spree, and just last week, the Biden administration proposed to smack the country with the largest tax hike in American history.

The last thing American families can afford is more of the same recklessness that got us where we are.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. President, now on a different matter, the Constitution makes the President and the Senate partners in selecting Supreme Court Justices. And as a practical matter, each Senator gets to define what "advice and consent" means to them.

For much of the 20th century, Senates typically took a different approach. Senators tended to give Presidents a lot of leeway as long as nominees checked basic professional and ethical boxes.

But then the political left and Senate Democrats initiated a series of major changes. In the late 1980s, Democrats thrust the Senate into a more aggressive posture toward nominations with an unprecedented, scorched-earth smear campaign that took aim at a nominee's judicial philosophy.

The Washington Post editorial board said back at the time that the formerly "conventional view" that Presidents would get great deference had now "fallen into . . . disrepute." They worried that a "highly politicized future" for "confirmation proceedings" might lie ahead following Democrats' actions.

Well, just a few years later, personal attacks on then-Judge Thomas made the previous hysteria over Judge Bork seem like lofty debate by comparison.

And 1 year after that, in 1992, then-Senator Biden proclaimed that if another vacancy occurred toward the end of President Bush 41's term, the Judiciary Committee should not hold any hearings before the Presidential election.

Well, that situation didn't arise that year, and once President Clinton took office, Republicans did not try to match Democrats' behavior simply out of spite. We tried actually to deescalate. Justices Ginsburg and Breyer both won lopsided votes with opposition in single digits. That was during a time when Republicans were in the majority.

But the very next time that Democrats lost the White House, the precedent-breaking tactics came roaring back.

During the Bush 43 administration, Senate Democrats, and especially the current Democratic leader, took the incredibly rare tactic of filibustering judicial nominations and made it routine.

The press at the time described the sea change:

They said it was important for the Senate to change the ground rules and there was no obligation to confirm someone just because they are scholarly or erudite.

Democrats decided that pure legal qualifications were no longer enough. They wanted judicial philosophy on the table.

So, 20 years ago, several of the same Senate Democrats who are now trumpeting the historic nature of Judge Jackson's nomination used these tactics to delay or block nominees, including an African-American woman and a Hispanic man—both, of course, nominated by a Republican President.

In one case, Democrats suggested their opposition was specifically—listen to this—specifically because the nominee's Hispanic heritage would actually make him a rising star.

Half-half-of Senate Democrats voted against Chief Justice Roberts, the best appellate advocate of his generation. All but four Democrats voted against Justice Alito, who had the most judicial experience of any nominee in almost a century.

There was no question about the basic legal qualifications of either, but Democrats opposed both. And in mid-2007, more than a year before the next Presidential election, Senator SCHUMER expanded upon the Biden standard from 15 years prior. He said that if another Supreme Court vacancy arose, Democrats should not let President Bush fill it.

Our colleague from New York proposed to keep a hypothetical vacancy open until an election that was more than a year away. During President Obama's terms, Republicans took up the same hardball tactics that Democrats had just pioneered.

But our colleagues recoiled at the taste of their own medicine and broke the rules to escape it. They preferred to detonate the "nuclear option" for the first time ever rather than let President Obama's nominees face the same treatment they had just invented—invented—for President Bush's.

Democrats did not then change the rule for the Supreme Court because there was no vacancy. But the late Democratic leader Harry Reid said publicly he would do the same thing for the Supreme Court with no hesitation.

By 2016, Democrats had spent 30 years radically changing the confirmation process, and now they had nuked the Senate's rules. Obviously, this pushed Republicans into a more assertive posture ourselves.

So when an election-year vacancy did arise, we applied the Biden-Schumer standard and did not fill it. And then, when Democrats filibustered a stellar nominee for the next year, we extended the Reid standard to the Supreme Court.

In 2016 and 2017, Republicans only took steps that Democrats had publicly declared they would take themselves. Yet our colleagues spent the next 4 years—4 years—trying to escalate even further.

Justice Gorsuch, impeccably qualified, received the first successful partisan filibuster of a Supreme Court

nominee in American history; Justice Kavanaugh got an astonishing and disgraceful spectacle; and Justice Barrett received baseless, delegitimizing attacks on her integrity.

Now, this history is not the reason why I oppose Judge Jackson. This is not about finger-pointing or partisan spite. I voted for a number of President Biden's nominees when I could support them, and just yesterday, moments after the Judiciary Committee deadlocked on Judge Jackson, they approved another judicial nominee by a unanimous vote.

My point is simply this: Senate Democrats could not have less standing to pretend—pretend—that a vigorous examination of a nominee's judicial philosophy is somehow off limits.

My Democratic friends across the aisle have no standing whatsoever to argue that Senators should simply glance—just glance—at Judge Jackson's resume and wave her on through.

Our colleagues intentionally brought the Senate to a more assertive place. They intentionally began a vigorous debate about what sort of jurisprudence actually honors the rule of law. This is the debate Democrats wanted. Now it is the debate Democrats have. And that is what I will discuss tomorrow—why Judge Jackson's apparent judicial philosophy is not well suited to our highest Court.

VOTE ON MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge.

The yeas and nays have been previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 127 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Hassan	Padilla	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	

NAYS—50

Barrasso	Ernst	McConnell
Blackburn	Fischer	Moran
Blunt	Graham	Murkowski
Boozman	Grassley	Paul
Braun	Hagerty	Portman
Burr	Hawley	Risch
Capito	Hoeven	Romney
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Collins	Inhofe	Rubio
Cornyn	Johnson	Sasse
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cramer	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Lee	Shelby
Cruz	Lummis	Sullivan
Daines	Marshall	

Thune	Toomey	Wicker
Tillis	Tuberville	Young

(Mr. PADILLA assumed the Chair.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50.

The Senate being equally divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative, and the motion is agreed to.

The nomination is discharged and will be placed on the calendar.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Motion to Proceed

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 860.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 128 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Romney
Blumenthal	Kaine	Rosen
Booker	Kelly	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Lujan	Sinema
Casey	Manchin	Smith
Collins	Markey	Stabenow
Coons	Menendez	Tester
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Hassan	Padilla	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	

NAYS—47

Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hagerty	Rounds
Boozman	Hawley	Rubio
Braun	Hoeven	Sasse
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Cramer	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	Lummis	Toomey
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Paul	

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJAN). The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Ketanji Brown Jackson, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I proudly and happily send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 860, Ketanji Brown Jackson, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Patrick J. Leahy, Dianne Feinstein, Sheldon Whitehouse, Amy Klobuchar, Christopher A. Coons, Richard Blumenthal, Mazie Hirono, Cory A. Booker, Alex Padilla, Jon Ossoff, Patty Murray, Raphael G. Warnock, Sherrod Brown, Elizabeth Warren, Margaret Wood Hassan, Tina Smith, Ben Ray Lujan, Jacky Rosen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, later this week, perhaps in a day or two, the Senate will vote on the nomination of Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson to serve as a member of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Last week, I laid out my reasons for my opposition to this nomination, and yesterday, I voted against her nomination in the Judiciary Committee. But I want to make clear that my vote against Judge Jackson is not a rebuke of her legal knowledge, her experience, or her character. Judge Jackson is obviously very smart. She has vast practical experience, which I think is very useful. She is likeable. And she is very clearly passionate about her work.

The Senate's constitutional duty to provide advice and consent, though, requires us to look beyond Judge Jackson's resume and personality to understand her judicial philosophy and the lens through which she views her role as a judge.

Certainly, the Senate must evaluate whether Judge Jackson will act fairly and impartially. We have also got to make a judgment whether she will leave her personal beliefs and her policy preferences at the door and whether she will respect the bounds of her role as a judge or attempt to establish new judge-made law.

This last point is absolutely critical, in my view. The Founders wisely established a system of checks and balances to ensure that no person or institution wields absolute power. The legislative branch, of course, makes law; the executive branch enforces the law; and the judicial branch interprets the law. We have each got our responsibilities under the Constitution.

And while that is certainly a simplification of the duties of each of the three branches, it does illustrate that there are separate lanes or roles for each branch in our constitutional Republic. And we talked about that during Judge Jackson's confirmation hearing.

The judge said she understands the importance of staying in her lane. She used that phrase many times during the confirmation hearing. She said she would not try to do Congress's job making laws.

But over the years—and I think this is a blind spot for Judge Jackson and, frankly, many on the bench, particularly at the highest levels. Over the years, we have come to see a pattern of judges who embrace the concept of judge-made law.

In other words, it is not derived from a statute passed by the Congress, it is not derived from the text of the Constitution itself, but rather, it is made as a policy judgment without any explicit reference in the Constitution itself. Now, that, I believe, is judicial policymaking or legislating from the bench.

The Supreme Court over the years has developed various legal doctrines like substantive due process. That is a little more opaque, I would think, to most people than judge-made law, but basically, it is the same thing. It is a doctrine under which judges create new rights that are not laid out in the Constitution.

It shouldn't matter if a person ultimately agrees or disagrees with this new right. If you like the result, well, you are liable to overlook the process by which the judges reached a decision. But if you disagree with it, then, clearly, it is a problem to have judges—unelected, unaccountable to the voters—making policy from the bench, no matter what it is called.

It is deeply concerning, I think—and it should be—to all Americans, to have nine unelected and ultimately unaccountable judges make policies that affect 330-or-so million people and they can have no say-so about it at all. They can't vote for them; they can't vote them out of office; they can't hold them accountable. In fact, the whole purpose of judicial independence is so judges can make hard decisions, but they have to be tethered to the Constitution and the law, not made up out of whole cloth.

No judge is authorized under our form of government to rewrite the Constitution to their liking or impose a policy for the entire country simply because it aligns with their personal belief or their policy preferences.

As our Founders wrote in the Declaration of Independence:

Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

When judges find unenumerated and invisible rights in the Constitution and issue a judgment holding that, in essence, all State and Federal laws that

contradict with their new judge-made law is invalid and unconstitutional, there is no opportunity for anybody to consent to that outcome like you would if you were a Member of the Senate or a Member of the House. People could lobby us. They could call us on the phone. They could send us emails, use social media to try to influence our decision. They could recruit somebody to run against us in the next election. They could vote us out of office if they didn't like the outcome.

But none of that would apply to life-tenured, unaccountable Federal judges making judge-made law at the highest levels—no consent of the governed, no legitimacy which comes from consent.

Abraham Lincoln made clear that it is the concept of consent that is the foundation for our form of government. He said famously: No man is good enough to govern another man without that man's consent.

Of course, he used that in the context of slavery, and he was right; but it has broader application as well.

As I said, when it comes to the executive and legislative branches, it is easy to see how consent and the legitimacy that flows from that comes into play. Voters cast their ballot for Senators, for Members of the House, for the President.

Once a person is in office, voters conduct what you could describe as a performance evaluation. The next time that person is on the ballot, voters determine whether that person should remain in office or be replaced by someone new.

But, again, that is not true of the judicial branch, which highlights and demonstrates why the judicial branch is different, why it shouldn't be a policy maker, why judges shouldn't be pronouncing judge-made law that is not contained in the Constitution itself.

It is important that our courts remain independent and be able to make those hard calls, but even people like Justice Breyer, who Judge Jackson will succeed on the Supreme Court, has written books worried about the politicization of the judiciary, and I think that is one reason why our judicial confirmation hearings can get so contentious—witness Brett Kavanaugh's confirmation hearing, which was a low point, I believe, for the Senate Judiciary Committee and for the Senate as a whole.

But people wouldn't get so exercised over these nominations if people were simply calling balls and strikes like the umpire at a baseball game. Judges should be umpires; judges should not be players.

So Justices on the Supreme Court are not held accountable at the ballot box, and they aren't evaluated every few years for their job performance. They are nominated by the President and confirmed for a lifetime appointment.

When Justices engage in blatant policymaking, it takes away the power of

"we the people" to decide for ourselves and hold our government accountable. It speaks to that statement in the Declaration of Independence that says government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. But that is totally missing when it comes to judge-made law and identifying new rights that are nowhere mentioned in the Constitution.

Again, I understand, when you like the outcome as a policy matter, you are not liable to complain too much. But we should recognize this over the course of our history as a source of abuse by judges at different times in our history, and we have seen the horrible outcomes of things like *Plessy vs. Ferguson*, where the Supreme Court, without reference to the Constitution itself, using this doctrine of substantive due process, said that "separate but equal" was the answer for the conflict between the rights of African-American schoolchildren and the rest of the population. They said it is OK. You can satisfy the Constitution if you give them separate but equal educations.

Well, of course, that is a shameful outcome, and we would all join together in repudiating that kind of outcome. And, thankfully, years later—too many years later—*Brown v. Board of Education* established that the "separate but equal" doctrine was overruled, and that is as it should be.

But the point I am trying to make here is whether it is the Court's decisions on abortion or the right to marry a same-sex partner or separate but equal, or even things like the *Dred Scott* decision, which held that African-American fugitive slaves were chattel property, or in the famous *Lochner* case, where the New Deal Justices struck down an attempt by the government to regulate the working hours of bakers in New York.

All of these involved the use of this substantive due process doctrine as a way to cover up and hide the fact that it was judges making the law and not the policymakers who run for office.

I am also afraid that Judge Jackson did not always adhere to her own admonition that judges should stay in their lane. In the case *Make the Road New York v. McAleenan*, the American Civil Liberties Union challenged a regulation involving expedited removal of individuals who illegally cross our borders and enter into the country.

The Immigration and Nationality Act gives the Department of Homeland Security Secretary "sole and unreviewable discretion" to apply expedited removal proceedings. Judge Jackson, who presided over the case challenging that rule, ignored the law. She went beyond the unambiguous text to deliver a political win to the people who brought the lawsuit.

She barred the Department of Homeland Security from using expedited removal proceedings to deter illegal immigration. She stopped the administration from enacting immigration policies it had clear authority to implement according to the black-letter law. Unsurprisingly, that decision was appealed and ultimately overturned by the DC Court of Appeals. But this is an example of not staying in your lane and not deferring to Congress the authority to make the laws of the land when the Congress has been unambiguously clear.

So, ultimately, I believe that demonstrates a willingness to engage in judicial activism and achieve a result, notwithstanding the facts and the black-letter law in the case, and to disregard the law in favor of a political win for one of the parties.

But this is just exactly what I started off talking about. This is the opposite of consent of the governed, when judges ignore the laws passed by Congress, even when congressional intent is clear.

Unfortunately, that wasn't the only example of activism in Judge Jackson's decisions. We have heard a lot about this, and I think it was an entirely appropriate subject for questions and answers. Judge Jackson is an accomplished and seasoned lawyer and judge, and she knows how to answer hard questions.

During sentencing hearings, Judge Jackson has said she disagreed with certain sentencing enhancements for policy reasons. That is the word she used—for policy reasons—and she chose to disregard its application. That is not staying in your lane.

She also used a compassionate release motion to retroactively slash a dangerous drug dealer's criminal sentence because she didn't like that the government brought a mandatory minimum drug charge, even though the government had every right to do so under the applicable law.

The promise of equal justice under the law requires judges to follow the law regardless of their own personal feelings about the policy. Justice Scalia famously said that if a judge hasn't at one time or another in his or her career rendered a judgment that conflicts with their own personal preferences, then they are probably not doing their job right.

It is absolutely critical for our Supreme Court Justice to not only acknowledge but to respect the limited but important role that our judges play in our constitutional Republic. They shouldn't allow politics or policy preferences to impact their decisions from the Bench, and they can't use their power to invalidate the will of the American people based on invisible rights that aren't actually included in the Constitution itself.

In 1953, Judge Robert Jackson observed that the Supreme Court is "not final because [it is] infallible, but [it is] infallible only because [it is] final."

In other words, the recourse that we the people have when judges overstep their bounds when it comes to constitutional interpretation is to amend the Constitution itself—something that has only happened 27 times in our Nation's history—and it is a steep hill to climb, to be sure.

But it is important for the legitimacy of the Supreme Court itself for the judges to be seen as staying in their lane and interpreting the law, not making it up as they go along. I am reminded of another quote about the scope of the Judiciary's duties and powers. In 1820, Thomas Jefferson wrote, "To consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions [is] a very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy."

Once again, our Founders, our Founding Fathers, had the wisdom to establish three branches of government to share power to avoid any single person or institution from wielding absolute power, and to ensure that we maintain the proper balance of power. Justices need to stay in their lane and interpret the law, not make the law, particularly when the voters have denied consent from them for doing so.

So to summarize, to ensure that we maintain the proper balance of power under our Constitution, judges must only interpret the law and they can't allow activism to bleed into their decisions and they can't ignore black-letter law and they can't use doctrines like substantive due process to hide the fact that they are making up new rights that aren't contained anywhere in the written Constitution itself.

As I said before, I fear that, if confirmed, Judge Jackson will attempt to use her vast legal skills to deliver specific results and get outside of her lane by making judge-made laws that are not supported by the text of the Constitution itself. As I said in the Judiciary Committee, and I will say again, when the time comes to vote on Judge Jackson's nomination here on the Senate floor, I will once again vote no for the reasons I just stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3951

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to urge the Senate to take action to crack down on child pornography offenders and to protect our children. This is a growing crisis, and it is one that is near to the heart of every parent in America. I can attest to that as a father of three small children myself. I have got a 9-year-old, a 7-year-old, and a 16-month-old baby at home.

But I can also attest to it as a former prosecutor. As the attorney general for the State of Missouri, one of the first things I did was establish a statewide anti-human trafficking initiative and task force because what I saw as attorney general of my State was that human trafficking, including, unfortunately, child sex trafficking, is an exploding epidemic.

In my State and around our country, children are exploited, children are trafficked. And those who work in this area and those who prosecute in this area—law enforcement who work day in and day out—will tell you that the explosion of child pornography is helping to drive this exploding epidemic of child sexual exploitation and child sex trafficking.

The problem is that child porn itself is exploding. A New York Times investigative reporter found that in 2018, there were 45 million images of children being sexually exploited available on the internet—45 million. Just a few years before, it had been 3 million and in 2018, 45. Then, last year, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children found that that number had grown to 85 million—85 million images on the internet of children being brutally sexually exploited.

And as every prosecutor and every law enforcement advocate and every law enforcement agent who works in this area will tell you, that explosion of this material—which, by the way, is harmful in and of itself, is exploitative in and of itself—is driving a crisis of child exploitation and child sex trafficking in this country.

Now the nomination of Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson to the Supreme Court has helped bring this issue front and center. Her record of leniency to child sex offenders has been much at the center of her hearings, and it has startled the public. A recent Rasmussen survey found that following her hearings, 56 percent of all respondents said that they were troubled by her record on child sex offenders. That included 64 percent of Independents.

And they are right to be troubled. Her record is indeed startling. In every case involving child pornography where she had discretion, she sentenced below the Federal sentencing guidelines, below the prosecutor's recommendations, and below the national averages.

We now know that the national average for possession of child pornography—the national sentence imposed, on average, is 68 months. Judge Jackson's average is 29.3 months. The national average sentence for distribution of child pornography: 135 months; Judge Jackson's average, 71.9 months.

In fact, it is true for criminal sentencing across the board. The national average of all criminal sentences imposed in the United States, 45 months; Judge Jackson's average, 29.9 months.

This is a record of leniency. In the words of the Republican leader, leniency to the "extreme" to child sex offenders and on criminal matters in general.

But—but, but, but—we are told, and have been told for weeks on end now, it is not really her fault. We were told by the White House and Senate Democrats that it is not her fault because those Federal sentencing guidelines that she, in every case where she could went below—those guidelines aren't binding. Thanks to the decision by the Supreme

Court, by Justice Breyer and Justice Stevens, those guidelines are only advisory. And so we were told, repeatedly, that if we really want to get tougher sentences for child porn offenders, then we are going to have to change the law.

In fact, I see my friend Senator DURBIN here today, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. He said this to me multiple times during the committee.

On March 22, he said to me:

I hope we all agree that we want to do everything in our power . . . to lessen the incidence of pornography and exploitation of children. . . . I . . . want to tell you, Congress doesn't have clean hands. . . . We haven't touched this for 15, 16 or 17 years.

Senator DURBIN went on:

We have created a situation because of our inattention and unwillingness to tackle an extremely controversial area in Congress and left it to the judges. And I think we have to accept some responsibility.

And he went on:

I don't know if you—

Meaning me—

have sponsored a bill to change this. I will be looking for it. . . . If we're going to tackle it, we should.

Well, I agree with that 100 percent. I agree we should tackle it. This is the time to tackle it, and I am here to do that today. I am proud to sponsor and introduce legislation along with my fellow Senators MIKE LEE and THOM TILLIS and RICK SCOTT and TED CRUZ to get tough on child porn offenders.

Now, let's be clear. When Congress wrote the child pornography Federal sentencing guidelines, and it is Congress that wrote them substantially, way back in 2003—when Congress wrote them, they wanted them to be binding. Congress meant for these guidelines to bind Federal judges. The Supreme Court struck those guidelines down.

Now it is time to put it back into place. My bill would put a new mandatory—mandatory—sentence of 5 years for every child porn offender who possesses pornography, 5 years. If you do this crime, you ought to go to jail. It would make the guidelines binding for any and all facts found by a jury or found by a judge in a trial, restore the law to what Congress intended back in 2003, take away discretion from judges to be soft on crime, and get tough on child sex offenders. That is what this bill would do.

Now, I called this bill the Protect Act of 2022 because it is modeled on the PROTECT Act of 2003, when Congress wrote these guidelines. And I would just note for the record that I believe every Senator voted for it back in 2003, including the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator DURBIN, and every member of the Judiciary Committee, Republican and Democratic, who was serving at the time.

That act back in 2003 toughened penalties for child porn offenders, made the guidelines mandatory, and explicitly took away discretion from judges to sentence below the guidelines.

I think it was a pretty good law, and I think now is the time to act. Our

children are at risk. The epidemic of sexual assault, sexual exploitation, and victimization is real.

And let's be clear what child pornography is. It is an industry—an industry that feeds on the exploitation of the most vulnerable members of our society, that feeds on the spectator sport of child abuse and child victimization.

If you have a lot of images of child pornography, you ought to go to jail for a long time. If you possess child pornography, you ought to go to jail for at least 5 years. And, yes, it is time for every judge in America to get tough on child porn. That is what this bill would do, and I urge the Senate now to take this opportunity to act.

So as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 3951, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. I have to ask myself, why now? Why does the junior Senator from Missouri bring this bill to the floor of the U.S. Senate today?

When you think back, this matter has been considered. Originally, the guidelines were considered in 1984. The question of child pornography came back to us in 2003.

In 2005, there was a Supreme Court case about applying the guidelines on sentencing to these types of cases—a case known as *Booker*. We know that in 2005, that decision was handed down.

We know that in 2012, the Sentencing Commission said to Congress and to the world that you need to do something here. These guidelines that you promulgated don't reflect the reality of today.

We know, as well, that the guidelines were written—some were written in an era when the materials we are talking about were physical materials. And we now live in the world of internet and access to not just tens and hundreds but thousands of images, if that is your decision.

And all these things have happened, and we come here today—today. I don't know exactly how many years the Senator from Missouri has been in the Senate, but to my knowledge, this is his first bill on this subject that he has presented in the last few weeks. And I wonder why—why now?

Are there valid questions about sentencing guidelines? Certainly, there is no question about it. I said as much, and he quoted me.

The Sentencing Commission told us over a decade ago, in 2012: You have got a problem here. The world has changed, and the law doesn't reflect it.

But this is the first time, to my knowledge, that the Senator from Mis-

souri or any Republican Senator has tried to enact legislation on the subject. Why now? Well, I know why. He said as much. It is because we are now considering the nomination of Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson to the Supreme Court.

This Senator has suggested over the course of the last 2 weeks in hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee that somehow this judge—this judge who is aspiring to the Supreme Court—is out of the mainstream when it comes to sentencing in child pornography cases.

It is no coincidence that the Senator from Missouri comes to the floor today while Judge Jackson's nomination is pending on the Senate calendar. It was discharged from our committee by a bipartisan vote in the Senate last night. It is no coincidence that he is raising this issue within hours or days before her confirmation vote. It is one more, very transparent attempt to link Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson's confirmation with this highly emotional issue of Federal sentencing when it comes to child pornography or child exploitation.

There are some political groups—at least one well-known political group—that manufacture theories about child pornography, pedophilia, and the like and that even inspire deadly reactions to them, and they are cheering this on. I have seen their reactions already, this morning, in the newspaper. They are watching this and hoping that someone can keep this issue alive on the floor of the U.S. Senate—for them.

The Senator from Missouri has even gone so far as to make the outrageous claim that this woman, Judge Jackson—the mother of two wonderful girls, whom I had a chance to meet, a mother who comes to this issue not only as a judge but as the sister and niece of law enforcement officials who have been part of her family—in the words of the Senator from Missouri, that this woman “endangers children”—“endangers children.”

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. I will yield when I am finished.

One conservative former prosecutor called Senator HAWLEY's charges “meritless to the point of demagoguery.”

I have read so many reviews of the Senator's charges against this judicial nominee, and not one of them gives him any credence. They basically say: What you are dealing with here is a complicated area of the law, a controversial area of the law, and to try to ascribe to this one nominee these motives, these outcomes, is baseless and meritless.

Consider this: How can this judicial nominee possibly have the endorsement of the largest law enforcement organization in America—the Fraternal Order of Police—the endorsement of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and many other law

enforcement groups—how could she possibly have all of that and be as wrong on a critical issue as the Senator from Missouri has asserted?

How is it possible that the American Bar Association took a look at all of her contacts as a judge, as a lawyer, as a law student and came up with 250 individuals who knew her personally, appeared in court with and against her, judged her in her individual capacity as a lawyer—how can the American Bar Association interview those 250 and find no evidence of the charges that have been made by the Senator from Missouri? How is it possible that they would review all of this and miss such a glaring fact? They didn't.

They told us, under oath, that they were asked point blank: Is her sentencing standard soft on crime? different than other judges?

The answer was no, no.

The net result of it was that the American Bar Association found this nominee, whom the Senator from Missouri charges with these outrage claims—they found her to be unanimously “well qualified”—unanimously “well qualified.” Yet the Senator from Missouri believes that he has discovered something that the whole world has missed. Unfortunately, he is wrong, and he doesn't admit it.

When Judge Jackson is confirmed to the Supreme Court—and I pray that she will be later this week—it will be in part because she is a thoughtful, dedicated person who has worked as a judge for over 10 years. She has published almost 600 written opinions. She has had 100 cases wherein she has imposed criminal sentences and a dozen-plus cases involving children.

What the Senator from Missouri has done is to cherry-pick arguments from one small part of her service on the bench that has been debunked across the board. But let me say it again: Judge Jackson's sentences were appropriate exercises of discretion as a judge in applying the law to the facts in difficult cases.

It is interesting to me how the Senator from Missouri has carefully drawn lines to exclude Trump appointees to the bench who have done exactly what this judge has done as well—so-called deviate from the guidelines when it has come to sentencing. In fact, one judge from his State, from the Eastern District of Missouri, whom he has personally endorsed as a good judge—and he may well be—has followed the same practice as this judge. Did he raise that at all in the Senate Judiciary Committee about the Missouri judge who was doing the same thing as Judge Jackson? No, nothing.

There is nothing about these judges that is deviating from other-than-accepted practices. When 70 to 80 percent of sentences handed out by judges across America are using the same standard, Judge Jackson is in that mainstream, along with judges whom this Senator from Missouri has endorsed.

If this issue needs to be addressed—and I believe it does—we can do so if we do it carefully, and we should do it carefully. Make no mistake, I don't back off from my words. As a father, as a grandfather, as a caring parent, I sincerely consider this to be one of the most serious crimes—the exploitation of children. I can't think of anything worse.

The pornography issue certainly is out of control because of the internet and because of those who are making a dollar on it. We should take it very seriously—very seriously. It changes and destroys lives. But let's make sure we do this in the right way.

What have we done in the Senate Judiciary Committee?

It is great for the chairman to stand on the Senate floor and talk about the issue.

Well, what have you done, Senator?

Let me tell you what I have done, and I think the Senator from Missouri knows it.

We have done what we can to address this issue from many different angles. The committee held a hearing on the FBI's failure to properly investigate allegations against Larry Nassar for assaulting young athletes, Olympic gymnasts included, which enabled the abuse of dozens of additional victims. We called them on the carpet. We put them under oath. We brought the testimony forward. We didn't back away from the issue of child abuse.

Following that hearing, I introduced the Eliminating Limits to Justice for Child Sex Abuse Victims Act, with Senator MARSHA BLACKBURN, a Republican from Tennessee. The Senate has now passed this bipartisan legislation, which would enable those survivors of child sex abuse to seek civil damages in Federal court no matter how long it takes the survivor to disclose the facts of the case.

The committee has also unanimously reported a bill which the Senator from Missouri knows well, the EARN IT Act, which is legislation he has cosponsored with Democratic Senator BLUMENTHAL that will remove blanket immunity for the tech industry for violations of laws related to online child sexual abuse material.

I make no apologies for our approach on this, and there is more work to be done.

I want to tell you that I am tempted to leave it just at that but for one part, one thing I am concerned about.

Our Federal sentencing guidelines have been advisory, not mandatory, since the Supreme Court's 2005 ruling in the Booker case. This bill now being offered on the floor in a very quick fashion by the Senator from Missouri attempts to create mandatory sentencing guidelines for a single category of offense. It is not clear whether it passes the constitutional test of Booker. It could be a waste of time. We don't need to waste time in a critical area of the law that has been so controversial and has been considered and reviewed over decades.

Even so, it is a dangerous slope to go down. Imagine a world wherein every time it was politically advantageous—whether it was a Supreme Court nominee or a headline in the paper—that some Senator could come forward, disagree with a Federal judge in a particular case, and say: Let's pass a mandatory minimum sentencing guideline to take care of the matter.

That is no way to approach the law in a fashion that is used for deterrence and punishment. We need to be thoughtful about it. A subject of this seriousness, of this gravity, deserves more than a driveby on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

I invite my colleague to do his work on this issue as we all should—the work that is required, the work that is required by the seriousness of this matter.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, the Senator asks: “Why now?” Why act now?

It is because it is a crisis now, because there are 85 million images of children being exploited on the internet now, because child exploitation is exploding in this country now.

Today, the Senator lays bare on this floor the bait and switch that he and his colleagues have employed.

They say: Oh, Judge Jackson—it is not her fault. You should act on the law to change the law.

But when we come to change the law and do what this Congress did in 2003, to do it now in 2022—a measure that Senator DURBIN supported in 2003—he says: Oh, no, no, we don't need to act now. Why do it now? It is rushed. It is too hurried. Let's do it later. Let's think about it longer.

Then we hear recited again the bizarre claims that somehow child pornography is a conspiracy theory. This is something that Senate Democrats, including the chairman, have repeated over and over and over, led by the White House—the idea that child exploitation is a conspiracy theory.

I would just invite you to look any parent in America in the eye and tell them that the exploitation of children is a conspiracy theory—or any law enforcement agent or any prosecutor or anyone who is working on the exploitation, to combat the exploitation of children in this country. No. It is a crisis, and it is real. The fact that the Senate hasn't acted until now is, I think, shameful for the Senate. But why wait another day?

Now, I look forward, if the Senator is serious. He does hold the gavel in the Judiciary Committee. We could mark this bill up. We could hold hearings. We could take action. I would invite him to cosponsor this bill. He voted for it in 2003. Let's have hearings, then, if we can't vote on it today, if we can't debate it today. Let's have hearings. Let's mark it up. Let's take it seriously. I will wait. I suspect I will be waiting for an awfully long time.

Here is the bottom line: I am not willing to tell the parents of my State that I sat by and did nothing. I am not willing to dismiss child exploitation as just some conspiracy theory. I am not willing to abandon the victims of this crime to their own devices and say: Good luck to you.

No, I am not willing to do that—nor am I willing to excuse Judge Jackson's record of leniency that does need to be corrected. She should not have had the discretion to sentence leniently in the extreme, as she did, nor should any judge in America, in my view. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. We should fix it for everybody across the board, and we can begin by acting as we did in 2003.

So I am disappointed, but I can't say that I am surprised that this measure has been objected to today. All I can say is that I pledge to my constituents—I pledge to the parents of my State and, yes, to the victims of my State—that I will continue to come to this floor and that I will continue to seek passage of this act until we get action from this Senate to protect children and to punish child pornographers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, after 27 minutes of debate on the floor of the Senate, the Senator now believes we are prepared to change the law that has been debated for decades. He has put in a bill introduced 7 days ago. It has been 7 days he has had passion for this issue—enough to introduce legislation.

If you want to take on a serious issue, take it on seriously, and that means doing the homework on it. Yes, have a hearing. Of course, have a hearing. We want to make sure the people from the Sentencing Commission and others are part of this conversation. It isn't just a matter of throwing charges out against a nominee.

If you want to be serious about it, then admit the obvious: In 70 to 80 percent of cases involving child sexual abuse material, Federal judges struggle with the same sentencing that we have set down. In light of Supreme Court decisions, we understand—I ask for order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was no response to begin with to the Senator, so let's move forward.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I will say, as far as I am concerned, this is a serious matter that should be taken seriously. You don't become an expert by, 7 days ago, introducing a bill and saying: I have got it. Don't change a word of it. Make it the law of the land. Make it apply to every court in the land.

No. We are going to do this seriously. We are going to do it the right way, and we are going to tackle an issue that has been avoided for more than two decades, when you look at the history of it.

I find this reprehensible—the pornography, this exploitation of children—and there are no excuses whatsoever, but I am not going to do this in a slipshod, make-a-headline manner. We are going to do it in a manner that is serious, one in which we work with prosecutors, defenders, judges, and the Sentencing Commission, and get it right. It is time to get it right.

We wrote this law some 19 years ago, before the internet was as prevalent in society as it is today. Let us be mindful of that as we attack this problem and address it in a fashion that is befitting the Senate and the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois says that Congress hasn't acted in two decades; that is true. I haven't been here for two decades; he has.

There is no excuse to not take action now. There is no excuse to not act on this problem when we know what the solution is.

So, listen, if the Senator is saying today, if he is committing today, to holding hearings and marking up a bill to toughen the child pornography laws, to make mandatory the sentencing guidelines, that is fantastic. I will take him at his word. I look forward to seeing those hearings noticed and to seeing that markup noticed, and I hope it will be forthcoming.

I am here to make a prediction. I think we will be waiting a very long time, because let's not forget what his party and the Sentencing Commission, stacked with members of his party, have been recommending. It has not been to make child sentences tougher—child pornography sentences tougher. They have wanted to make them weaker.

What the Sentencing Commission has recommended, with its liberal members for years now, is to make them weaker. That is what Judge Jackson has advocated. She also wants to change the guidelines—to make them weaker.

I think that is exactly the wrong move, and that is why the Senator was here to block this effort today. He doesn't want there to be tougher sentences. He doesn't want to talk about this issue. He wants to sweep it under the rug. I am here to say I won't let that happen. I will be here as long as it takes. I will be advocating for this in the Senate Judiciary Committee as long as it takes, until we get justice for the victims of child pornography and child exploitation.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:47 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. SINEMA).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, the Senate will soon vote on the nomination of Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. I will vote against her nomination.

Judge Jackson may be a fine woman, but she is a dangerous judge. She built her career as a far-left activist, and it didn't change when she put on a robe 10 years ago. She personifies activism from the bench. She has crusaded to undermine criminal sentences, and she cannot be trusted to interpret the law or the Constitution as written.

Judge Jackson's record makes clear that her brief stint as a criminal defense attorney wasn't motivated merely by a devotion to equal representation of all. It was part of a deep commitment to leniency for criminals. Indeed, she has continued to act as a de facto lawyer for criminals from behind the bench as she did from in front of it.

Judge Jackson's average sentences for criminals are 34 percent lighter than the national average for criminal cases and 25 percent lighter than her own court's average, the DC District Court.

Disturbingly, some of the most sensational examples of her soft-on-crime attitudes are cases involving child pornographers. She has given more lenient sentences than recommended by the sentencing guidelines in every single child pornography case where the law allowed it—every single one, every time. Individuals sentenced by Judge Jackson for child pornography possession receive, on average, 57 percent lighter sentences compared to the national average. For child pornography distribution, the sentence is 47 percent lighter than the national average.

These aren't just numbers. These are predators, and they go on to commit more of the most heinous crimes imaginable because Judge Jackson lets them off so easy. In one case, Judge Jackson gave child pornographer Wesley Hawkins just 3 months—3 months—in prison when the sentencing guidelines recommended 8 to 10 years—3 months versus a recommended 8 to 10 years. Judge Jackson even gave him a sentence that was one-sixth as long as what her own probation office recommended. And a few years later, when Hawkins should have still been in prison for his original offense, he did something else that got him 6 more months in custody. That is twice as long as his original sentence.

When all 11 Republicans on the Judiciary Committee sent a letter asking for details of what happened to justify this new sentence, Judge Jackson refused to provide any further information—so much, I guess, for looking at her record, as she urged us to do.

Her leniency isn't limited to child pornographers, either. In 2017, Judge

Jackson apologized—she apologized—to a fentanyl kingpin—his own words: kingpin—because she couldn't find a way to sidestep the law to give him less than the mandatory minimum sentence. She was very sorry that she had to give him such a long sentence.

But I guess, where there is a will, there is a way. A few years ago, she found a way to resentence this self-described kingpin below the mandatory minimum sentence. Through a completely made-up reinterpretation, Judge Jackson made the First Step Act retroactive for this fentanyl kingpin, something Congress had explicitly tried to avoid when it passed the law. This was judicial activism, plain and simple.

In her testimony, Judge Jackson claimed that there were no victims in that case. She is wrong. Fentanyl trafficking is not a victimless crime, and anyone who doesn't understand that doesn't belong on the Supreme Court.

In another case, Judge Jackson granted compassionate release—compassionate release—to a man who brutally murdered a deputy U.S. marshal on the steps of a church at a funeral. While in prison, this cop killer threatened prison staff and was caught in possession of a dangerous weapon—not exactly a model inmate. He was repeatedly denied parole. Yet Judge Jackson granted him compassionate release because he had high blood pressure.

In yet another case, a career criminal assaulted a deputy U.S. marshal with a deadly weapon while resisting arrest. This was the third time that this criminal had assaulted law enforcement officers—the very officers who risk their lives to keep judges like Judge Jackson safe.

Judge Jackson didn't just sentence him below the government's request or the sentencing guideline range. She gave the criminal less time than even the criminal himself had advocated. You can't make this stuff up.

In 2013, a sex offender who had repeatedly raped his 13-year-old niece was arrested for falsifying sex offender registration records to avoid telling the government where he was living and that he was working at a daycare. The government sought a 2-year prison sentence, but Judge Jackson gave him just 1 year instead. And during that second year, when he would have been in prison, he tried to rape again and then bribed the victim with \$2,500 to recant her testimony. This dangerous sex offender was convicted of obstructing justice, yet when presented with a do-over, Judge Jackson sentenced him to just 24 months in prison for those violations. I wish I could say this was to her credit because, to be fair, 24 months was the sentence recommended by the government. But she ensured in her order that this sentence would run concurrently with his sentence in local DC jail so he only ended up serving 1 year instead of 2.

Judge Jackson habitually sympathizes with criminals over victims.

These are just a few of the many outrageous cases in Judge Jackson's record. The takeaway is crystal clear: If you are a criminal, you would be lucky to have your case assigned to Judge Jackson. If you are a victim or anyone else seeking justice, you should hope that your case is assigned to literally any other judge. As a trial judge, though, Judge Jackson could only help one criminal at a time. As a Supreme Court Justice, she would be able to benefit criminals nationwide, in all cases.

Judge Jackson's far-left activism extends beyond crime, as well. Not only did she engage in what the Sixth Circuit called an "end run around Congress" to retroactively reduce the sentence of the fentanyl kingpin I mentioned earlier, she also worked hard to strike down a Trump administration order expediting the removal of illegal aliens on equally specious legal grounds.

The law passed by Congress granted the Department of Homeland Security "sole and unreviewable" discretion—"sole and unreviewable" discretion—to decide which illegal aliens should be subject to expedited removal. Nonetheless, Judge Jackson inserted herself to strike down what she called "a terrible policy" by the Department of Homeland Security. Well, I regret to inform Judge Jackson that it is not her role in our system to decide whether immigration policy is good, bad, terrible, or any other adjective she wants to use, only whether it is lawful and authorized by law.

And, of course, the DC Circuit Court, which is not exactly a hotbed of conservative jurists, agreed and reversed Judge Jackson's decision noting that there "could hardly be a more definitive expression of congressional intent" than the language in that law that she disregarded. But Judge Jackson didn't care. She had an anti-Trump op-ed she wanted to write in the form of a judicial opinion.

Judge Jackson has also shown real interest in helping terrorists. It is true you shouldn't judge a lawyer for being willing to take on an unpopular case, but you can certainly learn something about a lawyer whose cases they seek out. And for Judge Jackson and her friends in the liberal legal profession, these cases were not unpopular at all. Judge Jackson represented four terrorists as a public defender, one of whom she continued to represent in private practice voluntarily, and she voluntarily filed multiple friend-of-the-court briefs on behalf of terrorists while in private practice.

To make matters worse, she apparently didn't even bother—when she was representing these terrorists, she didn't bother to establish a reasonable belief that what she filed with the court was factually true. Three of her four case filings were identical—word for word, comma for comma. She alleged identical facts and legal arguments in each case. The only dif-

ferences between the briefs were the names and the case numbers. And in every one of those cases, she claimed the terrorists had never had any affiliation with the Taliban or al-Qaida. And in every one of those cases, she accused the Bush administration and American soldiers of war crimes.

And who are these supposed innocent victims of American war crimes who, according to Judge Jackson, had nothing at all to do with terrorism, no siree, nothing at all? One of her clients designed the prototype shoe bomb that was used in an unsuccessful attempt to blow up a passenger airplane. Another planned and executed a rocket attack on U.S. forces in Afghanistan. And a third was arrested in a raid on an al-Qaida explosives training camp. Yet in every case, she claimed that none of them had anything to do with terrorism—not a thing, totally innocent, just goatherders who were picked up by marauding American troops.

You know, the last Judge Jackson left the Supreme Court to go to Nuremberg and prosecute the case against the Nazis. This Judge Jackson might have gone there to defend them.

Judge Jackson also refused to answer one commonsense question after another. For example, when Senator BLACKBURN asked her what a "woman" is, she pretended not to know. I asked her who has more of a right to be in the United States, new citizens who follow the rules or illegal aliens whose very first act in the United States was to break our laws. Judge Jackson refused to answer.

When I asked the simple question of Judge Jackson whether releasing Guantanamo Bay terrorists would make us more safe or less safe, she again pretended not to know the answer, even though it is published by the Biden administration.

I also asked Judge Jackson if criminals were more or less likely to commit a crime if they knew they would be caught, convicted, and sentenced. I asked this pretty basic question at least three times. It was not a hard question; yet, again, she refused to answer.

Judge Jackson also refused to say whether packing the Supreme Court was a bad idea, even though the judge for whom she clerked and seeks to replace, Justice Breyer, and the late, sainted Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg—neither of whom are known for their conservative views—were both willing to publicly denounce such court-packing schemes by the Democrats.

Judge Jackson may feign ignorance, not because she doesn't know these answers, but because liberal judicial philosophy is all too often based on denying reality. As a judge, Judge Jackson has denied that reality again and again. Judge Jackson will coddle criminals and terrorists, and she will twist or ignore the law to reach the result that she wants. That is not what we need in a Supreme Court Justice, and that is why I will be voting against her nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

BUDGET PROPOSAL

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, if a budget is a set of priorities, here are the President's: an expanded Federal Government, a diminished national defense, higher gas prices, and an open border. Those are the priorities reflected in the budget the President released last week, which contained pretty much what you would expect—more taxes, more spending, more borrowing, and, in all likelihood, more inflation as a result.

Big taxes and big spending have been the agenda for President Biden since he took office. After signing a \$1.9 trillion spending spree in March of 2021 that helped create the worst inflation in 40 years, President Biden spent much of last year pushing for still more spending to fund his vision of an expanded Federal Government.

In his 2023 budget, it is just more of the same. The President's budget would increase average yearly spending by 66 percent as compared to the average of the last 10 years. Sixty-six percent—that is a staggering spending increase. Yearly Federal spending under the Biden budget would average \$7.3 trillion. To put that in perspective, the total average spending in 2019 was \$4.4 trillion.

How is the President going to pay for this, if he even can? Taxes, a lot of taxes—"the biggest tax increase in history in dollar terms," according to Bloomberg.

The President, of course, attempts to sell the tax hikes he is proposing as something that won't affect ordinary Americans. That couldn't be more wrong.

That corporate tax hike that he keeps pushing—one study estimates that 31 percent of the corporate tax is borne by consumers. Another big portion of it is borne by labor, otherwise known as ordinary, hard-working Americans.

Higher prices, fewer jobs, lower salaries—we can expect to see all that and more if the President hikes taxes on companies. And I haven't even mentioned the fact that a corporate tax hike may end up hurting private pensions in the value of American's 401(k)s.

Then there are the tax hikes on conventional energy companies, the companies that produce the oil and gas that Americans use to heat their homes and to drive their cars. Increasing taxes on fossil fuel companies to the tune of tens of billions of dollars is pretty much guaranteed to discourage the additional energy production we need to drive down gas prices. Ironically, the proposals to go after traditional American energy production come from the same administration that is releasing oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to deal with high gas prices. You can't make this up.

Then there is inflation. Democrats helped create our current inflation cri-

sis by sending a lot of unnecessary government money into the economy via the so-called American Rescue Plan. The President's budget would essentially do the same thing, which means our already serious inflation crisis could get even worse.

I mentioned the big spending increases in the President's budget. But what I actually meant are the big non-defense spending increases because, while on paper it may look like the President is hiking defense spending, his supposed funding increase would be effectively canceled out by inflation.

When you take into account Democrats' historic inflation, it turns out President Biden's supposed defense spending increase could actually turn out to be a spending cut. Even in the best-case scenario, his budget would leave defense spending essentially flat, which would leave our military dangerously underfunded. That is a big problem.

In a rapidly evolving threat environment, the last thing we can afford is a self-inflicted defeat from underfunding our military. Given Russia's war of aggression in Ukraine and threats to NATO, an increasingly aggressive China, Iran's nuclear ambitions, North Korea's uptick in missile tests, and the Taliban taking over in Afghanistan, among other things, President Biden should be taking national defense spending at least as seriously as domestic spending, but he is not.

The Biden budget proposal would leave the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Space Force under-equipped and undermanned and put our defense planning on a dangerously insufficient trajectory.

The President's budget also fails to adequately address border security and immigration enforcement.

Almost since the day the President took office, we have been experiencing an unprecedented flood of illegal immigration across our southern border. In fiscal year 2021, the Border Patrol encountered more than 1.7 million individuals attempting to cross our southern border, the highest number ever recorded. We have had 12 straight months of border encounters in excess of 150,000, and the surge is likely to even get worse now that the President has rescinded the title 42 border policy to immediately deport individuals illegally attempting to cross the border.

What is the President's answer?

Well, \$150-million cut to the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement next year. That is right. We are experiencing an unprecedented surge of illegal immigration, and the President's budget would cut funding to Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Perhaps the most outrageous thing about the President's budget is the way he misrepresents it. He is now trying to portray himself as somewhat fiscally responsible, as if a 66 percent higher yearly average spending than the last 10 years could be considered fiscally responsible. The President is

talking a lot about deficit reduction—both the deficit reduction he has supposedly created and the deficit reduction his budget will supposedly produce.

But the actual numbers will, again, tell a very different story. The deficit reduction the President would like to take credit for is partly the result of the end of temporary COVID spending measures, which were scheduled to end whether the President lifted a finger or not. Our current deficit would have been a lot lower if the President hadn't decided that we needed a partisan \$1.9 trillion spending spree last year, a spending spree entirely—entirely—made up of deficit spending.

When it comes to the President's 2023 budget, the administration claims "deficits under the budget policies would fall to less than one-third of the 2020 level the President inherited."

The key phrase there is "the 2020 level the President inherited." And 2020 saw a huge but temporary surge in government spending to deal with the onset of the COVID crisis.

As a result, it is grossly deceptive to take the 2020 deficit as a baseline. A more honest assessment of the prospects for deficit reduction under the President's budget would look at pre-COVID deficits as a baseline and compare the President's future deficits to those, but that wouldn't suit the President's purposes.

Now that it has become apparent that the American people are not, in fact, thrilled by far-left Democratic governance, the President is eager to portray himself as a moderate—hence his inflated claims of deficit reduction.

It is the same reason the President is touting his supposed spending hike on national defense while conveniently omitting the fact that when you figure in real inflation, the spending hike may actually be a spending cut.

No matter how the President tries to dress it up, his fiscal year 2023 budget is more of the same far-left priorities—more taxes, more unnecessary spending, and more economic pain for the American people.

And I hope, I hope my Democratic colleagues will think twice before foisting this budget onto hard-working Americans.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of the nomination of Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson to serve as an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. When confirmed, Judge Jackson, who currently serves on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the

District of Columbia Circuit, will take the seat on the Supreme Court that Justice Stephen Breyer has held for almost three decades, so I would like to first offer a few words about Justice Breyer as he prepares to step down from the Bench.

Justice Breyer has served the Court and the Nation with grace, expertise, humility, brilliance, and an unwavering dedication to justice. He has worked tirelessly to build consensus among his colleagues, and he has always kept in mind the real-world impacts of the Court's decisions on the American people.

Justice Breyer knew that "justice for some" was a failure of the Court. From his opinions on voting rights to reproductive rights, to the Affordable Care Act, he has been a key voice in many historic decisions that have affected so many Americans. We owe him a great debt of gratitude. And I am honored and privileged to call Justice Breyer a dear friend, and I wish him the best in his retirement.

Now, in looking for Justice Breyer's successor, President Biden said that he wanted to nominate a "persuasive" Justice, someone in the mold of Justice Breyer, and with Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson, President Biden has found that person.

I am confident that Judge Jackson—who clerked for Justice Breyer on the Supreme Court—will follow in his footsteps as a Justice who will make a lasting contribution on the Court through her pragmatism, evenhandedness, and deep understanding of the Constitution and the impact that the Court's decisions have on all Americans.

And as the first African-American woman Justice on the Bench, Judge Jackson's historic nomination is an important and long overdue step toward making the Supreme Court better reflect the Nation whose people the Court serves.

Fifty-four years ago yesterday, our Nation, our world, lost the guiding light of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to assassination. That loss was incalculable. We can only imagine the society we would live in if Dr. King were still with us, preaching, marching, teaching, and I have no doubt that Dr. King would be on the steps of the Capitol as the loudest and proudest voice in support of Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson to be our next Supreme Court Justice and the first Black woman to serve on our highest Court.

He would know that with the appointment and confirmation of Judge Jackson, we would take the long overdue step to make the Nation's top Court look more like and better represent all of the American people.

The legacy of the more just, more equal society that Dr. King pushed us to create is alive and it is well in this confirmation and on the floor and hearing rooms of the U.S. Senate this week.

The Judiciary Committee held 4 days of hearings on Judge Jackson's nomination, including 2 days of testimony

from the judge herself. As we all saw, some of the questioning of Judge Jackson from some of my Republican colleagues was nothing short of offensive, distorting her record, and tinged with racism and sexism. But Judge Jackson responded with poise. She responded with brilliance. She calmly addressed and corrected her questioners' false and misleading premises.

And she did so while demonstrating deep knowledge of the law and the Constitution, respect for precedents, and displaying precisely the kind of temperament we expect of someone sitting on the Nation's highest Court.

The hearings showed the Nation that Judge Jackson possesses all of the essential qualities of a jurist committed to the words engraved above the entrance to the Supreme Court itself "Equal Justice Under Law."

Of course, to anyone who knew Judge Jackson before her introduction to the Nation as a Supreme Court nominee, none of this was surprising. Judge Jackson's qualifications to serve on the Supreme Court are second to none. She holds broad experience across the legal profession—as a Supreme Court clerk, as a Federal public defender, as an attorney in private practice, and as a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission, as a Federal district court judge, and as a Federal appellate judge.

It was, therefore, surprising to no one that she earned a unanimous "well qualified" rating from the American Bar Association. Let me speak for a moment about one aspect of Judge Jackson's background that stands out, and that is her experience as a public defender.

When confirmed, Judge Jackson will become the first-ever Justice with background as a public defender and the first Justice with significant criminal defense experience since the service of Justice Thurgood Marshall, who retired in 1991. That work as a Federal public defender has unjustly come under attack from my colleagues across the aisle who suggest that being a public defender means that she is soft on crime.

But my Republican colleagues—who far too often focus singularly on the constitutional right to bear arms—would do well to remember that among the Constitution's other enshrined rights is the Sixth Amendment's right to counsel in criminal cases. Without that right, criminal defendants who cannot afford an attorney would find it difficult or impossible to navigate the Court system with their rights protected, including the fundamental right to a speedy and fair trial.

My Republican friends may also want to consider that Judge Jackson comes from a law enforcement family, with a brother and uncle serving as police officers, and that she has won the endorsement of the Fraternal Order of Police, the Nation's largest police union.

Now, let me remind my colleagues that public defenders do not select

their client. They take on every assigned case because they are committed to preserving and defending constitutional rights for everyone. As a Federal public defender, Judge Jackson represented the most vulnerable among us. She represented the clients other lawyers avoided, and in doing so, she followed a long and honorable tradition in the American legal profession that began with John Adams stepping forward in 1770 to represent the British soldiers who committed the Boston Massacre because he feared that they would not receive a fair trial without adequate representation.

By confirming Judge Jackson, we will affirm that the rights of those who cannot afford a lawyer are just as important as the rights of those who can pay lawyers charging \$1,000 an hour; that the rights of the indigent and powerless are just as important as those of the rich and the powerful.

Public defenders also experience firsthand and, therefore, understand better than other lawyers just how our justice system treats the accused, how it treats people of color, how it treats low-income people. Every day, public defenders see the systemic biases and prejudices that permeate our criminal justice system.

At a time when the United States holds more people behind bars than any other Nation on Earth—including authoritarian regimes like North Korea and China—the highest Court in the land would greatly benefit from a Justice with a public defender background. Public defenders serve as a unique bulwark of liberty and racial justice. So we should welcome a public defender on the Supreme Court, especially one as well qualified as Judge Jackson. Her singular perspective and voice are sorely needed.

Judge Jackson's service as a trial judge on the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia is also of particular note in this nomination. Only one of the current Supreme Court Justices—Justice Sotomayor—has ever served on a trial court. And as a trial court judge, Judge Jackson worked to ensure the parties before her understood her approach to deciding cases.

Judge Jackson has explained that, as a trial judge, she emphasized speaking directly to the individuals who appeared before her, not just to their lawyers. She used the parties' names and treated them with respect. She sought to ensure that those whom her rulings would directly impact clearly understood the proceedings in which they were involved, what was happening, and why it was happening.

This approach speaks to a judge who understands the importance of accessibility to the law, to a judicial process that isn't shrouded in mystery, and to a system that fulfills its promise of equal justice under the law to everyone. We will be fortunate to have such a Justice on the Supreme Court of the United States.

I have had the opportunity to meet with Judge Jackson one-on-one. I came

away deeply impressed and convinced that President Biden has made a great choice. The Senate has already confirmed Judge Jackson three times on a bipartisan basis—most recently in June of 2021, when she was confirmed to the D.C. Circuit. The Senate should again confirm her with bipartisan support.

And when Judge Jackson is confirmed and becomes Justice Jackson, the first African-American woman ever to take a seat on the High Court, she will be an inspiration to so many across our country and around the globe. She will especially be a role model for young Black girls everywhere, showing them that in the United States of America, nothing is beyond their reach.

Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall once said:

Sometimes history takes things into its own hands.

History says it is time for Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson, and I am honored to help her and the Court and our country make history with her confirmation.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote to confirm Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson to the Supreme Court of the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

WOMEN VETERANS' HEALTHCARE

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I rise today to recognize the significant legislative victories the Senate recently delivered for women veterans with the passage of two pieces of legislation to modernize breast cancer screening policies and the delivery of lifesaving care for women veterans.

Breast cancer is the second most common cancer for women. For women veterans and servicemembers, the incidence of breast cancer is estimated to be up to 40 percent higher than the general population.

Given the dangerous environments in which military members serve and additional risk factors associated with these locations, it is long overdue for the Department of Veterans Affairs to update its policies for administering mammograms.

We know early detection is crucial to preventing and treating breast cancer, so making sure those who are more vulnerable receive screenings at a younger age is not only reasonable but critical.

This would have helped Dr. Kate Hendricks Thomas, a Marine veteran, who was unaware of her increased risk for breast cancer. She shared her memories of deployment to Fallujah in 2005 with the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee last year.

She understood the risk associated with IEDs, and she remembers the burn pits—so commonplace, they were largely ignored—but she wasn't concerned with the impact of what she called "the flaming poison" surrounding her would have on her own health.

In a routine medical appointment with her VHA health provider in 2018, Kate thought it was odd she was recommended to undergo a mammogram. That exam subsequently led to her diagnosis of stage IV breast cancer. She was 38 years old.

That is devastating news for anyone to face, and I know the entire Senate joins me in praying for Kate as she continues her fight against cancer.

Nobody would blame her for focusing on her own health battle, but she knows her story wouldn't be the last if something didn't change.

That is why Kate is being an advocate for modernizing VA policies so other veterans don't experience the same struggles she is living with.

We honored her activism by crafting and passing the Dr. Kate Hendricks Thomas Supporting Expanded Review for Veterans in Combat Environments Act. It will broaden veteran access to mammograms and also require the VA to compile data regarding the rates of breast cancer among members of the veteran and civilian population so we can continue improving procedures to better treat breast cancer patients.

The Senate also unanimously passed the MAMMO for Veterans Act to expand access to high-quality breast cancer screenings, improving imaging services in rural areas, and clinical trials through partnerships with the National Cancer Institute.

The VA is uniquely positioned to be a leader in the prevention and treatment of breast cancer. Taking full advantage of the Department's unique capabilities, resources, and outreach will help deliver the lifesaving care that veterans deserve.

Passage of the Dr. Kate Hendricks Thomas SERVICE Act and the MAMMO for Veterans Act reflects the bipartisan support for improving veteran services and benefits. I appreciate Senator WYDEN's support and the leadership in the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee and the leadership of Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee Chairman TESTER, who has been my reliable partner in advancing policies to improve the VA's care and services for women.

The VA estimates women make up 10 percent of our Nation's veteran population and continues to be the fastest growing population.

Last Congress, we made significant progress to expand VA's care and services for women with the passage of the landmark Deborah Sampson Act.

This was an important first step, and the legislation we passed last month continues to build on this foundation so we can fulfill the promise made to women who served in our Nation's uniform.

I am pleased the Senate has approved these policies, and I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to follow our example and quickly approve the Dr. Kate Hendricks Thomas SERVICE Act and the MAMMO for Veterans Act so that they can be signed into law.

The women who have served our country in uniform need to know we are taking every step available to protect their health. These bills are an important downpayment in that mission. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

REMEMBERING THOMAS HORACE PORTER

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam President, I come to the floor today to mourn the passing and celebrate the life of Thomas Horace Porter, my good friend and a man who could put a smile on my face even in the toughest times, on one of the most painful days of my life, while I was recovering at Walter Reed.

Among the peer visitors at Walter Reed Hospital, two of the most beloved were Tom and his wife Eleanor.

Tom was a gentle giant—a tall, smiling, then-74-year-old veteran who showed up at my bedside while I was still sedated to talk with my husband and mother and who came to visit again soon after I regained consciousness.

As a young Army lieutenant in the Korean war, Tom had lost both his legs in a landmine explosion. His heroic actions saving his men on that day earned Tom both the Silver Star in addition to the Purple Heart for his combat injuries.

During his months of recuperation back in the States, Eleanor—or El, as we all know her—an Army second lieutenant herself, had been one of his physical therapists.

The couple ended up married for more than 50 years. Tom continued to serve our Nation—this time as a civil servant, achieving the rank of Senior Executive Service in the Department of Agriculture. When Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom began and the wounded began flooding the wards at Walter Reed, Tom and El decided that they needed to help. They became peer visitors, and for the next 7 years, during twice weekly visits, they changed the lives of countless veterans who passed through that hospital, my own included.

When I was at Walter Reed, Tom made it his mission to talk with injured troops about the full lives they will lead after their devastating injuries.

A lot of the wounded warriors around me were really young, just 19 to 24 years old, lying in their hospital beds with limbs missing, burns to their faces and bodies, skulls crushed and encased in protective metal cages or helmets. They were all facing a future none of them had planned for. Like them, I had always assumed I would either die in combat or come home. The third option of coming home severely injured was never something that occurred to the majority of us.

Tom would walk in with that big smile of his and say: Hey, I was like you. Lost my legs at 22. But I recovered and I have had a full and regular life. I courted El after I lost my legs, and she and I have been married for 50 years and have wonderful kids and grandkids.

He reassured them that they could still have the lives they dreamed of, and his words had weight because he was living proof that that was possible.

He would wink and joke: Listen, having an amputation is better than having a puppy. Trust me, you won't have any trouble getting the ladies.

And then he would answer any questions they had because he knew they needed to hear from someone who had already journeyed on the road they were about to travel.

For years, Tom and El came into Walter Reed every Tuesday and Thursday without fail. El was known as the Cookie Lady because she would bring in dozens of homemade cookies that she collected from folks at her church.

For those of us who were in the hospital a long time, El knew our favorites. Mine were oatmeal raisin. If I was at physical therapy or in surgery or getting my wounds debrided when El made her rounds, she would make sure to leave a little bag of cookies by my bedside table. It was a real treat in the midst of the painful, early stages of recovery—something to look forward to every week.

Tom and El. El and Tom. The two of them became family for all of us. They would bring me and my husband to their lakeside home, feed us home-cooked meals, and let me fall asleep in their hammock overlooking the water, knowing the good that getting out of that fluorescent-lit hospital room would do me.

As someone who loved and was desperately missing the ocean, I can't begin to describe how restorative those days by the lake were.

There are no words for how right it felt to be drifting off to sleep to the sound of waves hitting the shore rather than to the beeps and the buzz of the hospital machines that had been my nightly soundtrack for too long.

And there is no possible way to express just how grateful I am to Tom and El for making that a possibility; for giving me a taste of home, right when I felt most like a stranger to myself; for enveloping me in something good and whole right when I felt untethered from what I felt was my life's mission; and for simply being who they were—kind and fierce, as compassionate for the people they loved as they were passionate about the causes that they believed in.

They were our advocates, our heroes, our Tom and our El.

I am so sorry for your loss, El. We miss Tom every single day. Thank you both for all you did for me and what you did for all of us. We miss you desperately.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. REED. Madam President, we are debating the President's nominee to succeed Justice Stephen Breyer, who has served this country admirably and with great distinction.

As a law student, I was fortunate to have Justice Breyer as an adviser, and I remain grateful for his guidance, encouragement, and counsel as I began my legal career. I have immense respect and admiration for him as a Justice, but even more so as a person.

When Justice Breyer announced his retirement, I stated my belief that the next Justice on the Supreme Court should be someone with Justice Breyer's integrity, independence, and keen intellect—someone with real-world experience who reflects the depth and breadth of the American people. You could not find someone who better fits that description than Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson, and I rise today in wholehearted support of her nomination to the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court is a powerful arbiter of justice in our Nation, with few checks on the decisions of the Justices once they are on the Court. Therefore, a vote on a Supreme Court nominee is one of the most consequential that any Senator can cast. The Constitution makes the Senate an active participant, along with the President, in the confirmation of a Supreme Court Justice.

Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution states that nominees to the Supreme Court shall only be confirmed "by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate." The Senate's role in the confirmation process places an important democratic check on America's judiciary. As a result, this body's consent is both a constitutional requirement and a democratic obligation. It is in upholding our constitutional duties as Senators to give the President advice and consent on his nominations that I believe we have one of our greatest opportunities and responsibilities to support and defend the Constitution of the United States.

As I have stated before, my test for a nominee is simple and is drawn from the text, the history, and the principles of the Constitution. A nominee's intellectual gifts, experience, judgment, maturity, and temperament are all important, but these alone are not enough. I need to be convinced that a nominee for the U.S. Supreme Court will live up to both the letter and spirit of the Constitution. The nominee needs to be committed not only to enforcing laws but also to doing justice.

The nominee needs to be able to make the principles of the Constitution come alive—equality before the law, due process, full and equal participation in the civic and social life of America for all Americans, freedom of conscience, individual responsibility, and the expansion of opportunity. The nominee also needs to see the unique role the Court plays in helping balance the often conflicting forces in a democracy between individual autonomy and the obligations of community, between the will of the majority and the rights of the minority. A nominee for the Supreme Court needs to be able to look forward to the future, not just back-

wards. The nominee needs to make the Constitution resonate in a world that is changing with great rapidity.

Judge Jackson passes these tests with flying colors. Beyond her unquestioned intellectual gifts, her legal career over the past two decades demonstrates that she has the deep fidelity to equality, justice, and the Constitution required to be our next Supreme Court Justice.

We want Justices to be familiar with the Federal court system. Judge Jackson is. Indeed, soon after law school, Judge Jackson chose to clerk at three levels of the Federal courts, gaining valuable insights into the courtroom and learning directly from incredible jurists, including Judge Bruce Selya of Rhode Island, who was President Reagan's nominee to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, as well as Justice Breyer himself.

We want Justices to understand that a guilty verdict involves the hard task of deciding the appropriate punishment. So while many of her law school classmates likely plotted paths to law firm partnerships, she chose instead to serve as Assistant Special Counsel and, later, Commissioner and Vice Chair at the U.S. Sentencing Commission, working to prevent unjust disparities in sentencing.

We want Justices to embody the fundamental notion of fairness at the heart of our justice system, that defendants have a right to counsel and must be proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. So Judge Jackson chose to serve as a Federal public defender. If confirmed, she will bring this valuable, real-life perspective to our highest Court, where it is very much needed.

Over the past 10 years, first as a district judge and then as a circuit judge, Judge Jackson has been evenhanded and impartial in her decisions from the bench, without regard to partisanship, personal views, or ideology. Her opinions showcase an admirable commitment not only to fairness but to transparency. She takes the time to ensure that the parties fully understand her rulings and that the record clearly captures her thought process in deciding a case. She does not hide the ball—there are facts, there are arguments, and everyone is invited to read and understand them.

Beyond her career choices and accolades, she demonstrated her judgment, maturity, and equanimity during her recent confirmation hearings. In the face of hours of questioning, some of it quite pointed, political, and discomfiting, she showed incredible patience, resilience, and grace. Her independence, integrity, and deep understanding of the Constitution shined through in her answers. Her cool in that crucible was not only admirable, it was inspiring.

Judge Jackson is a trailblazer, not in the least because she is the first Black woman and first Federal public defender nominated to the Supreme

Court. While her individual accomplishments are personal, Judge Jackson's elevation to the U.S. Supreme Court will bring America closer to the ideal our country aspires to. Her service on the Supreme Court in the years to come will ensure that the Justices better reflect the diversity of our great nation and may help restore the people's faith in the fairness of the Court and in our justice system.

It is with great pleasure that I support her nomination to the highest Court in the land and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENERGY

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to talk about the need for more American energy.

On Thursday, President Biden announced that he is going to release even more oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. To me, this is another desperate Hail Mary pass. It is a short-term effort to deal with their midterm election crisis. It is a crisis that has been created by the policies of this administration.

The real crisis is the cost-of-living crisis, and it is a crisis that is punishing American families. Inflation is at a 40-year high. Gas prices recently hit the highest price ever. Why is it happening? It is economics 101. The supply of energy is not keeping up with the demand for energy.

We are now producing about 1.3 million barrels of oil per day fewer—less—than we were in 2019. Yet, for the last 14 months that Joe Biden has been in the White House, he has done absolutely nothing to increase the supply of American energy. He has not sold one lease to produce energy on public lands—not one. President Obama, at this time into his first term, had already held 47 Federal lease sales—in his first 14 months in office. For Joe Biden, the number is still zero.

This just shows that when it comes to energy, Joe Biden is to the far, far left of any previous American President. Joe Biden is already the most anti-American energy President we have ever had. He refuses to do any of the things that would actually help our country in terms of our energy needs. He won't increase oil production by a single drop. No. He wants to release some from the strategic reserve but not actually produce any more American energy.

What he is essentially doing is burning through our savings account. This is now the third time that President Biden has released energy from the strategic reserve. He is on pace to burn

through a third of our oil savings in less than 2 years in office. Soon, we are going to have the smallest amount in our reserve, the smallest amount in our savings account, since 1984.

In November, Joe Biden conducted the largest release in history from the strategic reserve. He released 50 million barrels. So what was the result? He made a big announcement of it. The Secretary of Energy did as well. The price of gas went down by 2 cents—2 cents. The White House was so proud of itself that they actually sent out a press release congratulating themselves. Prices went back up almost immediately. The result was an utter failure. So now Joe Biden said he is going to release 180 million barrels over the next 6 months, which is a million barrels a day for the next 180 days—in other words, between now and right before the elections.

The strategic reserve is meant for emergencies. It is not meant for the cynical, political coverup of what the President has done to our American energy policy. Some people call it an election-year gimmick. I call it dangerous—dangerous because we are going to be less prepared for emergencies and be less secure as a nation. We will be less safe.

Now, 180 million barrels sounds like a lot. It is about the amount we use on an average of 9 or 10 days. We use about 20 million barrels a day in the United States. We are currently importing a lot more than that.

Even the President admits that it won't have a big impact, but he doesn't know what else to do. On Thursday, he said this would reduce prices by as little as 10 cents a gallon. We are still over \$4 a gallon nationwide in terms of the national average. I expect it is going to remain that high, over \$4 a gallon, through the summer.

So who do the American people blame for this? Well, in poll after poll, they blame Joe Biden because he is the one who proudly stood there and beat his chest and said: I have killed the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The day Joe Biden took office, gasoline was \$2.38 a gallon. America was energy independent for the first time in 70 years. We were energy dominant. We were exporting energy. We were selling it to our friends instead of having to buy it from our enemies. Joe Biden took office and started attacking American energy, and things have deteriorated ever since.

That is why it is no surprise that energy and gas prices were up 13 out of the last 14 months. By the time Vladimir Putin invaded Ukraine, the average price of a gallon of gas had gone up from \$2.38 gallon to \$3.53 a gallon. So it was already up over \$1.15 a gallon in just over that first year in office for President Biden. Today, the average price of a gallon of gas is about \$4.18.

Prices may actually go higher if Joe Biden gets his way in terms of energy policy. That is because, when the President put out his budget, we found

he wants to raise taxes on American energy. The budget that the President has proposed for the next year contains 36 new taxes, and 11 of them are directly on American energy. It would cost about \$45 billion, which, of course, would be carried on to the people who buy American energy. It would be paid by working families in the form of higher gas prices, higher oil bills. It would cost more to heat your home.

Even NANCY PELOSI, when she looked at the budget, said:

Consumers pay for that.

On Thursday, Joe Biden asked Congress to charge fees on oil and gas leases that aren't even being used. Now, this is another gimmick. People want to use those leases, but the administration is blocking the permission to drill to use the leases. This is just a continuation of the Biden blame game.

If you want to explore for energy in America, the lease is just the first step, the first of many. You need to apply for a permit to drill. In Wyoming, people know all about this. They call it an APD, an application for the permission to drill. You have to pay to apply after you have paid the rent on the lease.

So you apply, and somebody has to make a decision. Those decisions used to be made at the local level. Not anymore. Now the Biden administration has said: We know better than any of you people out around the country. We will make all of the decisions out of Washington.

The decision they have made is they are not going to give any of these permits to drill. That is why the President could say: They are not drilling.

Well, you are not letting people drill.

Now, we are not talking about a couple of leases; we are talking about thousands and thousands—over 4,000 leases—that are tied up that way.

We have another group of leases that is tied up by environmental activists who love to sue to stop energy exploration. They want to keep it in the ground.

So companies are paying their rental fees. They want to explore for energy, but they are being blocked by the administration. Then they are being blamed by that same administration for not exploring for energy.

The President says: Use it or lose it.

Well, that is the law of the land right now. If it doesn't produce oil or gas within 10 years, you actually lose the permit. He doesn't want to explain that to folks.

If the lease does produce energy, if it does produce oil, then the government actually reaps the benefits from that. They get tax money from that. That helps to pay for many of the things that we do as a government. In Wyoming, in our State areas, we use it to help with paying for education, with paying for healthcare. These are vital services in the community that are paid for by the successful exploration and recovery of energy that is currently underground and that Joe Biden wants to keep underground.

In the President's budget, he wants to charge an additional fee on top of all of this. So he refuses to let them drill, and he wants to charge them for not drilling. This is something out of "Alice in Wonderland." More fees will mean producing less. We need to produce more. That is the way to get down the price at the pump—to produce more American energy.

Democrats refuse to admit that the percentage of leases that are actually being used today has never been higher. These are old leases. The Democrats' excuses on this issue are what I would put in the category of the Big Lie—the Big Lie to support an anti-American energy agenda. It is an agenda of less American energy, more taxes, and higher prices. It is the reason millions of American families today are struggling to get by. They are feeling the pain.

According to one estimate from economists at Bloomberg, American families will spend an extra \$5,200 this year—that is \$100 a week—compared to last year, just to stay even. It is all due to inflation in the cost of groceries, the cost of gas, the cost of goods. All of those things are squeezing American families. People are getting crushed. Their dreams are being crushed. Potential savings to send kids to college—that is going away. The savings for a vacation—that is going away. You have to empty your wallet to fill your tank under Joe Biden's energy policies, and the extra \$100 a week is on top of last year's inflation whereby people across the country said they were paying more and more to get less and less and that even if they got a raise, they couldn't keep up. They have kept falling further and further behind.

People across the country are already living paycheck to paycheck. They can't afford more price increases. They need real solutions, and they are not getting them from this White House. The answer seems pretty simple: Stop the reckless spending here in Washington. Unleash American energy.

President Biden needs to do a couple of things right away to unleash American energy.

The first is to have a long-term commitment to produce more American energy. Energy companies aren't going to invest if they think Joe Biden is going to shut them down tomorrow, and in a recent speech, he said that is what his goal is. He wants them to produce more today so he can shut them down tomorrow.

He does need to open up our Federal lands. We should auction off leases right away, and Joe Biden should approve those 4,600 drilling permits, which, today, are still stuck in limbo. He put them there and locked them in.

It takes months to get production up and running. You have to get the right permits. You have to tap the pipelines. You have to speed up the process for pipelines as well. Although we did see the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission—all of the Commissioners—

come to the Energy Committee, they don't seem to be very interested—at least the ones in the majority don't seem to be very interested—in speeding up the pipeline process or in allowing pipelines at all.

Finally, Joe Biden needs to stop attacking the hard-working men and women of this country who continue to produce energy, who go to work every day to keep the lights on and to keep us warm in winter. We need these workers out there, and Joe Biden needs to stop attacking them on a daily basis. They are the ones who can get us out of the crisis. They are the ones we need for the economic recovery.

Instead of spending our savings, it is time to unleash American energy. We need more American energy, and we need it now.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2022—Motion to Proceed

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 4373, under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 310, H.R. 4373, a bill making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Robert Menendez, Michael F. Bennet, Tammy Baldwin, Tim Kaine, Angus S. King, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Tina Smith, Gary C. Peters, Tammy Duckworth, Christopher Murphy, Mark Kelly, Alex Padilla, Richard Blumenthal, Patty Murray, Elizabeth Warren.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 4373, a bill making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 129 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Kelly	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Leahy	Smith
Casey	Lujan	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Hassan	Padilla	

NAYS—52

Barrasso	Grassley	Romney
Blackburn	Hagerty	Rounds
Blunt	Hawley	Rubio
Boozman	Hoehn	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Collins	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cotton	Lummis	Tillis
Cramer	Marshall	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Tuberville
Cruz	Moran	Wicker
Daines	Murkowski	Wyden
Ernst	Paul	Young
Fischer	Portman	
Graham	Risch	

NOT VOTING—1

Menendez

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. For the purposes of reconsideration, I change my vote to no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 47, the nays are 52. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. SCHUMER. I enter a motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. And I ask unanimous consent to resume executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

H.R. 4373

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I want there to be no mistake about what just happened here on the Senate floor. Republicans blocked a bipartisan bill that would provide vaccines, testing, and therapeutics for the American people.

Yesterday, a group of Democrats and Republicans announced we had reached a bipartisan agreement for COVID relief funding, but today, a majority of Senate Republicans have blocked this critical and much-needed funding from going forward.

Vaccines, therapeutics, and testing were negotiated in good faith. And it should not—they should not be held hostage to extraneous, unrelated issues. This is too important for the health of the American people. But that seems precisely what some Republicans want to do.

This is a potentially devastating vote for every single American who is worried about the possibility of a new variant rearing its nasty head within a few months.

It is devastating for any American who, in the future, looks for a vaccine or a booster shot, only to be told supplies have run out.

It is devastating for anyone looking down the line to get tested because they feel sick or want their families safe and discover no tests are available. It is devastating for anyone who—God forbid—falls seriously ill but can't access lifesaving therapeutics because the Federal Government can't purchase new supplies because of the vote our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle just took.

Too many Republicans seem to want to play politics at a time when we need to work together to pass legislation our country desperately needs. Republicans voted no on vaccines for kids. Republicans voted no on tests for new COVID variants. Republicans voted no on therapies to save lives and make us less sick.

Have we learned nothing from the last 2 years of living with this horrible disease? Have Republicans learned nothing about how lack of preparation could damage our economy? This money—the money that they rejected today—will go a long way to keeping our schools, our businesses, our churches, our communities running as normally as possible.

If we want to stay at normal, we need these dollars. Without these dollars, the risk of schools closing, of businesses closing, of public transportation closing is too large.

Should a future variant rear its nasty head—should a future variant rear its nasty head—Americans will know who voted against more funding. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

This was a \$10 billion agreement that was fully paid for. If there is another surge, it costs us 10 times that if we are behind the curve again.

I hope Republicans will get serious about this. It should not be so difficult

for them to do something so good and important for our country. There is still some time. I hope my Republican colleagues change their tune quickly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

CHILD TAX CREDIT

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to address the Senate on an issue of real importance to our country and to families in Colorado and all across the United States.

Today, 120 economists wrote an open letter—in the face of the inflation that we are now facing as a nation, as a result of the economic growth that we are having coming out of this very deep recession, and the supply chain interruptions that have caused inflation, 120 economists sent an open letter saying:

The expanded Child Tax Credit is one of the easiest, most effective, and direct tools currently at our disposal to help families deal with the impact of inflation on family budgets.

The expert opinions about the causes of and solutions to rising inflation are as varied as the authors of this letter, but we agree on this: the expanded Child Tax Credit is too small to meaningfully increase inflation across the whole economy.

That means that that \$100 billion a year that the child tax credit costs to lift half the kids out of poverty isn't going to drive inflation in a \$21 trillion economy. That is one of the points these economists agreed on.

“[B]ut,” they wrote, “it will make an important difference for family budgets, especially families in the bottom half of the income spectrum. Monthly Child Tax Credit payments are a proven success at helping families keep up with the everyday costs of keeping a family afloat.”

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the open letter signed by 120 economists.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPEN LETTER FROM ECONOMISTS: EXTEND THE EXPANDED CHILD TAX CREDIT TO HELP FAMILIES KEEP UP WITH RISING COSTS

The cost of everything from food and fuel to housing and clothes is going up at the fastest pace in decades. Families need relief. The expanded Child Tax Credit is one of the easiest, most effective, and direct tools currently at our disposal to help families deal with the impact of inflation on family budgets. A recent analysis by Moody's found that inflation is costing the average family \$296 per month, with lower-income families being hit even harder. Each \$250 to \$300 monthly child tax credit payment can offset the toll inflation is taking.

The expert opinions about the causes of and solutions to rising inflation are as varied as the authors of this letter, but we agree on this: the expanded Child Tax Credit is too small to meaningfully increase inflation across the whole economy, but it will make an important difference for family budgets, especially families in the bottom half of the income spectrum. Monthly Child Tax Credit payments are a proven success at helping families keep up with the everyday costs of keeping a family afloat. With inflation causing those very costs to rise, the Child Tax

Credit is even more important now to help families meet their basic needs.

PARTIAL LIST OF SIGNERS

Dean Baker, Center for Economic and Policy Research; Nina Banks, Bucknell University; Chris Benner, University of California Santa Cruz; Alan Blinder, Princeton University; Indivar Dutta-Gupta, Georgetown Center on Poverty and Inequality; Teresa Ghilarducci, The New School for Social Research; Darrick Hamilton, The New School for Social Research; Samuel Hammond, Niskanen Center; Elaine Maag, Urban Institute/Tax Policy Center; Ioana Marinescu, University of Pennsylvania School of Social Policy and Practice; Manuel Pastor, University of Southern California; Bob Pollin, University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Organizations listed for identification purposes only; views should be attributed to the individual, not the organization, its trustees, or funders.

FULL LIST OF SIGNERS (118)

Alan Aja, Randy Albelda, Mona Ali, Elizabeth Ananat, Eileen Appelbaum, Kate Bahn, Dean Baker, Nina Banks, Chris Benner, Eli Berman, Alan Blinder, Peter Bohmer, Elissa Braunstein, Howard Chernick, Israel Chora, Kimberly Christensen, Jennifer Cohen, Steve Cohn, Amy Crews Cutts, Sheldon Danziger.

Matthew Darling, Stephanie Didwania, Peter Dorman, Laura Dresser, Indivar Dutta-Gupta, Gary Dymski, Alison Earle, Todd Easton, Kevin Egan, Luciana Etcheverry, Doyne Farmer, Deborah M. Figart, Daniel Finn, Nancy Folbre, John Gallup, Teresa Ghilarducci, Fabio Ghironi, Jacob Goldin, Neva Goodwin, Ulla Grapard.

Mitchell Green, Erica Groshen, Robin Hahnel, Darrick Hamilton, Leah Hamilton, Samuel Hammond, Douglas Harris, Martin Hart-Landsberg, Marianne Hill, Emily Hoffman, Dorene Isenberg, Sarah Jacobson, Fadel Kaboub, Haider Khan, Mary King, Tim Koehlin, Andrew Kohen, Jeanne Koopman, Edith Kuiper, Ronald Lee.

Margaret Levenstein, Catherine Lynde, Elaine Maag, Arthur MacEwan, Ioana Marinescu, Thomas Masterson, Gabriel Mathy, Aine McCarthy, Elaine McCrate, John Miller, Kyle Moore, Katherine Moos, Sucharita Mukherjee, Michele Naples, Julie Nelson, Reynold Nesiba, Joseph Nowakowski, Stephen Nunez, Jennifer Olmsted, Lindsay Owens.

Lenore Palladino, Elizabeth Palley, Manuel Pastor, Francisco Perez, Chiara Piovani, Robert Pollin, Bina Pradhan, Kelsey Pukelis, Morgan Richards-Melamdir, Yana Rodgers, Leopoldo Rodriguez, Stephen Roll, Giacomo Rondina, Lygia Sabbag Fares, Max Sawicky, Peter Schaeffer, Juliet Schor, Elliott Sclar, Stephanie Seguino, Tim Smeeding.

Mary Stevenson, Samuel Stolper, Diana Strassmann, Kay E. Strong, Chris Tilly, Zdravka Todorova, Mariano Tarras, Dietrich Vollrath, Mark Votruba, David Weiman, Mark Weisbrot, Thomas Weisskopf, Jeannette Wicks-Lim, Kathryn Wilson, Rachel Wilson, Brenda Wyss, Yavuz Yasar, Andrew Zimbalist.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, this is no surprise to me. I was for the child tax credit before we had COVID because for the last 50 years, as I have said before on this floor, we had an economy that has worked really well for the top 10 percent of Americans and basically hasn't worked for anybody else.

We have some of the lowest economic mobility in the industrialized world. We have got some of the greatest income inequality in the industrialized world.

Stunningly—stunningly—in the last two economic downturns, economic inequality has only gotten staggeringly worse in this country because of the massive asset inflation that has benefited the wealthiest people in the economy who are in the position to make money on their money or, in the case of a lot of people, on real estate. In Colorado, it is making it harder and harder and harder for working people to find a place to live.

And I can tell you that our kids pay the highest price from this.

I was the superintendent of the Denver Public Schools before I was in this job. A majority of kids were kids of color; a majority of kids were kids living in poverty. And their families were working—contrary to what some people around here think, their families were working two and three jobs. The problem wasn't that their families weren't working. It wasn't that they weren't working hard. They were killing themselves, and no matter what they did, they couldn't get their kids out of poverty, and that is not a consequence of anything that is their fault. They are doing everything they can. For that matter, their kids are doing everything they can—going to schools that ought to do a better job for the kids living in poverty all over this country.

And some people think that we have to just accept this as a fundamental aspect of our economy or our democracy or our society; that somehow the United States of America is such a failure as a community that we have to accept being 38 out of 41 industrialized countries in terms of childhood poverty; that we are willing to permanently accept the idea that the poorest people in our society are our children.

I think there is something we can do about it. I know there is something we can do about it. I know there is a lot of skepticism about the Federal Government's ability to do anything well. I share that skepticism sometimes.

We fought two wars in the Middle East that lasted for 20 years, that cost about \$5.6 trillion—seems like a set of bad decisions.

We have cut taxes on the floor of this body by \$8 trillion since 2001. Almost all of the benefit of that has gone to the wealthiest people in the country, when we have got the worst income inequality that we have had since 1928.

It has been staggering to watch—it has been staggering to watch people stay here at the end of a legislative year, at the end of a Congress, and burn the midnight oil to make sure that we can extend the tax cuts for the wealthiest people in the country and for the largest corporations in America.

That is how you know it is 2 o'clock in the morning in the U.S. Senate. It is when we have to extend tax cuts for the richest people in this country during a time of devastating income inequality that is perpetuated by the economic cycles that we continue to have.

But last year, Mr. President, as you know, because you were a big part of this, we did something different. We adopted the expanded child tax credit; we adopted the expanded earned income tax credit. Those bills were Bennet-Brown and Brown-Bennet, respectively—my friend SHERROD BROWN from the great State of Ohio.

And here on this, ahead of tax day, I wanted to come down to the floor just to give you a little report, kind of a book report, a status report on what has happened.

And what I want to tell you is it worked. It worked. It worked. We discovered we didn't have to live in a society that was 38 out of 41 industrialized countries. We discovered that we didn't have to accept the world where the poorest people in our country were our children.

We benefited 61 million kids in the United States—90 percent of the children in Connecticut, 90 percent of the children in Colorado, and 90 percent of the children all across this country directly benefited from a bill we passed here.

We cut childhood poverty nearly in half. We cut hunger by a quarter for families with kids during a pandemic, which feels like a worthy thing to have done. We did it without adding a single bureaucrat to the Federal Government. We did it without adding one more Federal Agency. We proved we could do it.

And then we didn't extend it at the end of the year. And now, predictably, childhood poverty is shooting up in the United States of America. Hunger is shooting up in the United States of America.

I was on the phone with the leaders of the food banks across Colorado who have done such an incredible job during this recession and during the last recession making sure people are fed. I have visited some of those food banks. I know that people are saying to me that there are, you know, two-thirds of the people who are showing up were people who didn't show up before we had this catastrophe of COVID.

But guess what is getting longer now, as a result of our failure to extend the child tax credit. It is the lines in these food banks. It is the people coming to get food for their kids instead of being able to go to the grocery store with the dignity of the expanded child tax credit.

There is a shred of good news here that I wanted to just speak about for a second because this will be my chance to do it, and I just want to remind people that as families file their tax returns, they will receive the second half of their child tax credit, which is worth up to \$1,800 per child. That is still available. It is not coming in a monthly form anymore. It is not coming into your bank account anymore in that automatic way, but when you file your tax returns, you will receive it.

And the other thing, because of the EITC work that we did—the earned income tax credit work—workers with-

out children will receive the expanded EITC, which we tripled last year—we tripled last year.

We finally decided we are not going to tax people into poverty anymore in this country, which is what we were doing before we expanded that.

So I wanted to remind families to claim their child and dependent care tax credit as well.

We expanded that last year to a maximum of \$4,000 per child, and in my view we have to continue to come down here and fight to make these credits permanent. And it is my goal for us to end childhood poverty in this country.

I think cutting it in half—that was an exciting thing. It has been a long time around here—decades, generations—generations since we have seen a reduction in poverty in this country like the reduction in childhood poverty we saw last year, generations since we have seen a reduction in hunger like we saw last year.

And the good news is, we now know that it is a fact that we can do it. There are a lot of countries in the world that have an expanded child tax credit or child benefit like the child tax credit, and in all those countries, fewer of their kids live in poverty.

And their workforce participation rates are actually higher, which doesn't surprise me at all, based on the stories I heard from families about what they were spending the child tax credit on, which was everything that had to do with their kids, from buying back-to-school clothes to paying for a bicycle so a young man in Colorado Springs could stay at school late so he could have extracurriculars that he otherwise wouldn't have had the ability to achieve, so that his mom could stay at work for a few more hours so she could provide for the family.

There is literally no data in America or anywhere else that doesn't support the idea that this is a pro-work policy, the child tax credit.

We didn't have any trouble, as I said earlier, extending the \$8 trillion of tax cuts that we have cut for the wealthiest people in this country since 2001.

For that money, we could have extended the child tax credit for 50 years. We could have doubled it for 25 years, and we could have ended childhood poverty in the United States of America. I guarantee you that would have been a better investment than sending money to people who need it least in our economy.

I would say to my own party that I am really grateful that we passed this last year, but I am deeply, deeply disappointed that we couldn't come together and extend it.

I am deeply, deeply disappointed that we haven't fulfilled our promise to reverse the Trump tax cuts for the richest people in America. It doesn't make any sense. It is completely upside down, but that is where we find ourselves.

I wish I could express how different it felt at the end of the year when it was

kids, many of whom were living in poverty and their families who were getting, on average, \$450 a month—when the lights were going out on them, and we just went home. We just went home. There was nobody burning the midnight oil here to make sure that the kids got the benefit of this.

And, by the way, even if you don't believe that living in a society where the poorest people are your kids and that it ought to be a purpose of a nation to lift kids who, through no fault of their own, find themselves in poverty; who, through no fault of their own, find themselves living in a country where we have less economic mobility than almost any other industrialized country in the world and therefore don't have the opportunity to rise that generations had before them—and, hopefully, generations that will come after them—and that are attending a system of education in this country because of the lack of early childhood education in the United States, because of the lack of quality K-12 education in this country, because of the incredible expense of higher education—who are attending a system that is actually reinforcing the income equality we have rather than liberating people from their circumstances.

(Mr. MARKEY assumed the Chair.) The best predictor of the quality of your education in this country is your parents' income, to the point of ruthlessness—to the point of ruthlessness.

I want to mention that Senator ROMNEY, who is a Republican from Utah, has a very similar bill to my bill to expand the child tax credit. In fact, it is basically the same bill. He is a little more generous with kids under the age of 6, and we have a difference of view on pay-fors, but I think that is a bridgeable difference. And I have no doubt that in the long term, we will come to a bipartisan agreement in this Chamber to make the enhanced child tax credit permanent; to decide that even if you don't care about the kids, which you should, that the country can't afford this level of childhood poverty, that our democracy won't be sustained with this level of income inequality. That is what I believe. That is what I know.

Childhood poverty costs the United States of America \$1 trillion dollars a year. That is why it is not surprising that Columbia University did a study and found that we get an 8x return—that the child tax credit would pay back the United States eight times what it costs. Again, what it costs is \$100 billion a year, but childhood poverty costs us \$1 trillion a year.

Instead of accepting the idea that we are going to be at the bottom of the cellar when it comes to kids living in poverty, what we said was: No, we are going to cut it in half.

And let me assure you, as a former school superintendent and—well, as a former school superintendent—the cost of mitigating for childhood poverty far exceeds the cost diminishing it.

It is an amazing thing to me, on top of everything else that we are talking about today, that when families are in the grip of the kind of inflation that they are in the grip of—which costs them somewhere between \$270 to \$300 a month, depending on where they live and depending on who they are—that it wouldn't occur to us that the easiest thing to do would be just to reinstate what we were doing last year and allow people to have the benefit of \$450 on average to raise their children, to pay for a little bit of extra childcare, to pay for a little bit of transportation to fix a car that is broken so they can stay on the job.

I know there are some colleagues here who think that this policy disincentivizes work. Even before we passed this last year, every study that looked at this that I was aware of, with the exception of one outlier that I think had terrible data—every single one—said that this was not going to negatively affect work.

And guess what. Now we have had a 6-month experiment in the United States of America, and every study, including the one by the American Enterprise Institute, which was a doubter about this policy—and I think probably still is a doubter about this policy—found that it had no effect on people's work habits.

The problem in America is not that people don't work hard. That is not the problem that we have in this country. People are killing themselves. And it is true that wages are up by about 5.6 percent since the Biden administration went into office, which is great, awesome. It is great, but we have had the effects of inflation, and we are a long way from having an economy that, when it grows, it grows for everybody, which, by the way, that is what we need to do. That is what we have to achieve.

This democracy will not survive another 50 years of an economy that, when it grows, it grows for the top 10 percent, and everyone else's wages are flat or everyone else is effectively in a recession. There is no evidence in world history that with that level of income inequality, that lack of economic mobility, that, over 100 years, you can sustain a democracy.

And we don't have to do that. We don't have to do that. We can make it permanent, put it back in place—pay for it, by the way. I believe we should pay for it by raising taxes on the wealthiest people in the country, like we said we were going to do by reversing the Trump tax cuts—the Trump giveaways which were sold as the middle-class tax cut. They were so smart because they gave people in the lower levels of the income ladder a little bit, to say: There is your Trump tax cut—so he could go out to the Mahoning Valley, go out to Youngstown, and tell people: You got your tax cut. You are welcome.

What he didn't tell them was that 52 percent of the Trump tax cuts went to

the top 5 percent of Americans; that after he left the people of the Mahoning Valley and Youngstown, an old steel town, and then he went on to Mar-a-Lago, where people were having a New Year's Eve dinner, or whatever it was they were having, and the first thing he said to them was: You are welcome. That was a lot closer to the truth.

You are welcome. You are welcome that I cut your taxes at a time when income inequality is greater than at any time since 1929. You are welcome that I cut the corporate rate to 21 percent, even though no one in corporate America was asking for a 21-percent tax cut. "You are welcome" is what he said.

I said earlier, Mr. President, before you were here, that there are people in the country that are skeptical of the Federal Government doing anything well and that I have my own skepticism for the reasons I said earlier. But there are people in terms of the child tax credit that said it would never work. You know, 6 months before we did it or 4 months before we did it, I was getting stopped by reporters every day asking: Do you think they are really going to be able to do this? Can the IRS, can the Department of Treasury—can they really administer this?

And the answer is yes, they did. They did a fantastic job. They didn't get everybody at first. They didn't get everybody at first, and we knew that would be a problem. We enlisted people all over the State of Colorado who worked with folks, who worked with working families and worked with families who are living in poverty, because, remember, this wasn't just about kids living in poverty.

Ninety percent—90 percent—of America's children benefited from this. That is why some people have called it Social Security for kids. Some people have called it universal basic income for kids. I think it is a good thing because I can tell you that 90 percent of the kids in Colorado can use the help; because 90 percent of the people in this country and in my State have not benefited from economic growth the same way the top 10 percent of Americans have for the last 50 years.

And, as I mentioned—I just want to say again on this floor because there were people out there saying, "People are going to drop out of the workforce,"—it did not happen. It didn't happen in other countries that have a tax benefit like this, and it didn't happen during the 6 months that we were here.

I understand that, maybe, we would have a different debate. People would say: Oh, my God, Michael, all these people dropped out of the workforce. It didn't work the way you said that it would.

It did work the way I said it would. It did work the way that data said that it would, and moms and dads—very unsurprisingly to me—who were working hard to begin with, probably just

worked harder because now they had the chance to pay for a little extra childcare. Now they had the chance to fix a car or, as I said, let their kid go to extracurricular activities so they could stay at work. And that is what all the studies have shown.

So I suppose one good thing has come out of this, which is—or maybe it is more than one good thing—it is that we now know that America is no different than any other place in this respect: that when parents get a marginal, incremental amount of money, they don't quit their jobs; they feed their kids. But as a society, we are able to say that we cut childhood poverty in half and we cut hunger in half—by 25 percent.

What good is it that now there are families that are lined up in soup kitchens, today, who weren't there 6 months ago because they had the benefit of the child tax credit?

As I said, parents spent this credit on all kinds of different things. I mentioned childcare. I mentioned the bicycle for extracurricular, but, I will tell you, the thing that I heard from every single parent that I talked to—and there were a lot of them in Colorado over the last 6 months, over the last 6 months of last year—was the stress that it had relieved for their family—that grinding stress of being in a recession, the grinding stress of being in the middle of a pandemic, the grinding stress of having your kids out of school or having interrupted schooling, the grinding stress of living in an economy where people are saying to you, no matter how hard you work, that somehow it is your fault that you can't give your family that; and that the decisions that we have made over many years in this Chamber and in the Chamber across there, and that some of the largest institutions have made as well, unfortunately, have created real headwinds for working people and for their families.

We are in the middle here of considering the China COMPETES bill, which I think gives us a real opportunity to reassess what we have been doing for the last 40 or 50 years.

Every single thing we set and we told the American people we were doing in their name with respect to China and its presence in the World Trade Organization and what China would do as a result of that—none of that turned out to be true. And when I say “China,” I don't mean the Chinese people. I mean Beijing. And we realize now that they weren't going to follow the rules of the road. We realize now that they were engaged in state-sponsored capitalism, and that is very hard to compete with; and that instead of just privileging the people in our society who want to make stuff as cheaply as possible in China, maybe we ought to be thinking about other things, like our supply chain—protecting our supply chain—or our national security or whether we are creating good-paying jobs in the United States so that when the economy grows, it grows for everybody.

We have an opportunity to do that now, and that is what I want. That is what I really want: It is an economy that, when it grows, it grows for everybody, because that is the American dream, that is the story we told ourselves about who we are as a people, and that is the way to strengthen our democracy. That is what I really want.

In the meantime, what I would like us to do, since we now know how to do it, finally, is lift half the kids in this country out of poverty so they have a chance to pursue the American dream themselves. I used to say that this Chamber treated America's children like they were someone else's children because of the education system that we have provided for them. And when we did the child tax credit, I came out here and I said: I can finally come to this floor and say: We are now treating America's children like they are America's children.

But, for the moment, that is no longer true, and, for the moment, we are treating them like they are someone else's children, and we will rue the day that we did this. We will rue the day that we did this.

This is a pro-work policy. It is a pro-family policy. It is a pro-democracy policy. We now know it worked, and it worked well. We have got to fight to make it permanent, and that is what I will do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

WAR CRIMES ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Europe has seen its share of horrors over the last century: the atrocities of World War I, World War II, as well as the Bosnian war. Ukrainians, in particular, suffered under the rule of Joseph Stalin. During the tragedy known as Holodomor, millions of Ukrainians died of starvation—forced starvation.

In the wake of some—but not all—of these atrocities, the world responded by bringing the perpetrators to justice. After World War II, of course, there were the Nuremberg trials; and after the Bosnian war, President Milosevic was charged with crimes against humanity by an international criminal tribunal.

Sadly, now, in 2022, we are faced with the question: How will the world react to the crimes that are now being committed in Ukraine?

Over the past week, we have witnessed the reality of Vladimir Putin's genocidal rampage on the innocent people of Ukraine, and the scenes of brutality in Bucha are seared in our collective memory.

Today, in Bucha, Ukraine, there are mass graves surrounded by bodies hastily shoved into garbage bags, civilian cars crushed like tin cans, and front yards and gardens lined with the dead bodies of innocent Ukrainian people.

One survivor, Antonina Pomazanko, aged 76, watched helplessly as Russian soldiers murdered her daughter, Tetiana. Without provocation, the Rus-

sian soldiers opened fire on her home, and the bullets ripped through the gates and fence as Tetiana was standing in the yard. She was killed in an instant.

On Sunday, the New York Times ran a photo of Mrs. Pomazanko looking over her daughter's dead body. Mrs. Pomazanko had covered it with plastic sheets and wooden boards. It was lying in the same spot where she was killed last month.

In the words of Mrs. Pomazanko:

There was so much shelling, I did not know what to do.

There is nothing that will fill the void of loss and despair that Mrs. Pomazanko and millions of Ukrainians feel at this very moment, but there is more—much, much more—that we, as Americans, must do.

The actions of Vladimir Putin harken back to some of Europe's darkest days—the atrocities committed by the Nazis during World War II, the massacres of the former Yugoslavia—days that we must endure and days which we hope we never have to relive. And as I mentioned, after the Allied Forces liberated Europe in 1945, the world responded. It came together at the historic Nuremberg trials.

When the trials first convened at the Palace of Justice on November 21, 1945, Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson delivered the opening statement.

He said:

The wrongs which we seek to condemn and punish have been so calculated, so malignant, and so devastating, that civilization cannot tolerate their being ignored because it cannot survive their being repeated.

“Civilization cannot tolerate” and “cannot survive” the war crimes we have witnessed in Ukraine going unpunished.

President Biden recognized that fact on Monday in his calling for a war crime trial for the horrors in Ukraine.

President Lincoln once said to Congress when he proposed an end to slavery:

We—even we here—hold the power, and bear the responsibility.

It is within the power and the responsibility of this body to deny safe haven in America or anywhere to perpetrators of these heinous crimes.

Under existing law, foreign war criminals who come to the United States, incredibly, cannot be prosecuted. They cannot be held liable in a civil action or even be deported for their heinous crimes. Currently, the War Crimes Act only applies if the perpetrator or victim is a U.S. service member or a U.S. national. In other words, it would not cover the Russian officials who are responsible for the commission of war crimes in Ukraine nor cover the Russian soldiers who committed those crimes.

We also don't have a statute or a law in America making crimes against humanity a violation of U.S. law. This was the primary offense prosecuted in Nuremberg, and it was a critical tool for holding violators accountable.

Other grave human rights violations, including genocide and torture, are already crimes under U.S. law that cover any offender found in the United States. This should also be true for war crimes and crimes against humanity, and that is why I will introduce the War Crimes Accountability Act.

The War Crimes Accountability Act will ensure the United States has the tools to hold accountable the perpetrators of war crimes and other atrocities. The bill expands the War Crimes Act to cover all war criminals who are in the United States, regardless of where they are from. It fills the gap in our criminal code for prosecuting crimes against humanity so that we can hold perpetrators who come to this country accountable.

This is not just a hypothetical idea. Consider one example: After the massacre of thousands of innocent men and boys in the Srebrenica massacre, a war criminal named Marko Boskic made his way to the United States. When law enforcement tracked him down, they could only charge him with visa fraud, not a war crime or crimes against humanity. We must bring war criminals to justice for their horrific crimes, not slap them on the wrist with a visa technicality.

The United States must never again provide safe haven for perpetrators of war crimes and crimes against humanity. Our Nation led the first prosecutions for crimes in the Nuremberg trials. It is time for the United States to lead again.

Ultimately, the day will come when Vladimir Putin faces justice, and his name and his regime will be remembered in history alongside the worst of the worst. Until Putin and his sycophants are brought to justice, we cannot waver—we cannot equivocate—in providing Ukraine with all the resources, weapons, and aid they need to triumph over Russia.

Quite simply, the United States of America should never be a safe haven for a war criminal. The United States of America should be holding war criminals responsible for their horrible conduct and what they have done to the poor and innocent people in other places, and they should be held liable on criminal and civil bases. That is what this bill would do. It is an effort to move forward with the cause of justice, but I hope it is only the beginning.

When nations around the world adopt similar laws to the ones which I am proposing, we will make it clear that there are no safe havens left for war criminals. They will pay a price wherever they end up, and that is the way it should be if there is going to be justice.

“Slava Ukraini.”
I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

BIDEN FAMILY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, Senator JOHNSON and I will present our third speech on the Biden investigation series.

Today, we will focus on James Biden, the President's brother. Hunter Biden wasn't the only Biden family member who had connections to the Chinese communist regime. James Biden did as well.

Before we begin our discussion, I think we will need to mention the main company once again, the Chinese company that goes by the initials CEFC.

In the first two speeches, Senator JOHNSON and I established the connection between CEFC and the communist Chinese Government. We established the connection between CEFC and Hudson West III. We then established the connection with Hunter Biden's Owasco, Hudson West III, and CEFC.

We showed that Hunter Biden and James Biden actively assisted CEFC as it worked to expand its footprint and its holdings in the global and U.S. energy sector. Today, we will add James Biden's Lion Hall Group to the list of Biden family companies connected to the communist regime.

In my and Senator JOHNSON's September 2020 report, we showed that Hunter Biden and James Biden and their aligned firms received approximately \$4.8 million from Hudson West III from August 2017 to September 2018. During that same timeframe, Hunter Biden's Owasco sent 20 or so wires to James Biden's Lion Hall Group. Those 20 wires totaled just about \$1.4 million.

The liberal media and our Democratic colleagues originally tried to claim that Senator JOHNSON and my findings were Russian disinformation.

Last week, the Washington Post reported the following:

Over the course of 14 months, the Chinese energy conglomerate—

Here, parenthetically, they are referring to CEFC—

and its executives paid \$4.8 million to entities controlled by Hunter Biden and his uncle, according to government records, court documents and newly disclosed bank statements, as well as emails contained on a copy of a laptop hard drive that purportedly once belonged to Hunter Biden.

The Post also reported this:

During that time period, about \$1.4 million was transferred from Hunter's account to the Lion Hall Group, the consulting firm that James Biden ran, according to other government records reviewed by The Post.

Senator JOHNSON and I were right 2 years ago. We knew it then, but it has been a long road to defend our work product.

The liberal media and our Democratic colleagues aggressively tried to make the case that we were peddling Russian disinformation. What will the liberal media and my Democratic colleagues say now in light of last week's Washington Post article that substantiated the work Senator JOHNSON and I have been doing? We still haven't received any apology from our Democratic colleagues for their false claims against us these past several years. They haven't apologized to the American people. And I am not going to hold my breath.

When will the big-time media in Washington awaken to respect my reputation for the thorough investigative and oversight work that I do as a Senator? And it is also my constitutional responsibility to do exactly that.

Now, we have more records to discuss today. Today, Senator JOHNSON and I will show you financial transfers direct from Hudson West III to the Lion Hall Group. In other words, in these transfers, Hunter Biden's Owasco isn't the middleman.

Let's look at the first poster here. This is a January 2018 bank statement from Hudson West III. Now, there is a lot going on here, so I will just mention several items.

First, we have two examples of more wire transfers from Hudson West III for \$165,000. The underlying wire data, which Senator JOHNSON and I will make public this very day, shows that money went to Hunter Biden's Owasco. That money was for the August 2017 LLC agreement, which by its terms saw James Biden become a manager of Hudson West III. That agreement sent \$100,000 to Hunter Biden and \$65,000 to James Biden every month. Those transactions occurred after the \$5 million wire from Northern International Capital to Hudson West III on August 2017. Northern International was connected to Ye Jianming, who was connected to the communist regime.

We explained all that in our second speech just last Tuesday.

Second, this statement shows several examples of wires from Hudson West III to CEFC. As Senator JOHNSON and I have established, that company is an arm of the communist Chinese regime. This new record shows how closely connected Hudson West III was with CEFC while Hunter Biden and James Biden received money from Hudson West III.

Third, we have a January 17, 2018, wire to Lion Hall Group. That happens to be James Biden's company. James Biden received \$18,000 from Hudson West III the same month that company sent money to CEFC. This is just one example of many.

Accordingly, the official bank record makes clear the financial connections between and among James Biden and the communist Chinese elements.

To the liberal media and my Democratic colleagues, this official bank record—is that Russian disinformation, as you accused us of spreading?

Now let's go to the second poster. This is a Hudson West III bank record from April 2018. Here, you see wire transfers from Coldharbour Capital. That company was connected to Mervyn Yan, who was an associate of Ye Jianming and Gongwen Dong.

As Senator JOHNSON and I have already established, all of them are connected to the communist regime. These are the players in the game that I mentioned in the first speech last Monday, and now we have established that they appear repeatedly in bank records with high-dollar transfers.

These transfers aren't by accident—no way. There is clearly a scheme here.

There is a plan among and between all these individuals and their respective companies, which then begs the question, has the Justice Department acquired these records? If so, what has the Justice Department done about these records?

Moving to the next transaction, there is another \$165,000 wire. Again, that relates back to the LLC agreement that connected Hunter and James Biden to the Chinese firm CEFC and its projects in the energy sector. Then you have a \$34,000 wire to James Biden's Lion Hall Group from Hudson West III.

So what was this all about? Let's take a look, then, at the third poster. Look at the sixth line from the bottom. I want to quote. It says "office expense and reimbursement." That is the same reason given for the first poster that I showed you.

We will make all these records public this very day.

For those of you who may still doubt my and Senator JOHNSON's oversight work, I am going to present one last transaction to bring all of this home.

Look at the fourth poster. In my and Senator JOHNSON's September 2020 report, we found that James Biden and Hunter Biden went on a \$99,000 global spending spree courtesy of whom? Another Chinese person I have mentioned so many times in these three speeches—Gongwen Dong. The spending spree included airline tickets, purchases at Apple stores, hotels, and restaurants. This bank record next to me shows a \$99,000 transaction in September 2017, but that is not all that we have.

Let's turn to the final poster. This is No. 5. This is a credit card authorization form for \$99,000. Look at the bottom. There is a signature block with Hunter Biden and Gongwen Dong.

To the liberal press and my Democratic colleagues, are these official records Russian disinformation?

So what is the point of all these records? Not only have Senator JOHNSON and I illustrated through new records that Hunter Biden was financially connected to the communist regime, these records show James Biden was as well. These new records show direct financial links between companies connected to the communist regime and James Biden through Lion Hall Group. These new records support the findings in our report to the last Congress.

Remember, those records were put out in September and November of 2020, and everybody was saying it was Russian disinformation. Forget the facts. Forget the evidence. Forget the investigative journalism. The liberal media wanted to provide cover for then-Candidate Joe Biden. They did whatever they could to smear our investigations.

With these new records, there can be no doubt that James Biden was financially connected to corporations and individuals with extensive links to communist China and that he and Hunter Biden were in it together, working

to help a Chinese Government-linked energy company pursue deals and expand its reach in the energy sector.

Now, it is Senator JOHNSON's turn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I thank Senator GRASSLEY.

What Senator GRASSLEY and I have showed over the course of six speeches are the actual bank records of financial transactions tying President Biden's son Hunter and his brother James to businesses that are essentially arms of the communist Chinese regime. But the Biden business ventures include activities in many more countries than just China.

In our September and November 2020 reports, we showed a vast web of Biden family foreign financial entanglements that were largely ignored by the media and falsely labeled "Russian disinformation" by our Democratic colleagues. As outrageous as the suppression of our reports and the false attacks were, perhaps the most egregious behavior came from 51 former intelligence Agency officials who lent their names and reputations to an effort designed to convince the American public that Hunter Biden's laptop had "all the classic earmarks of a Russian information operation."

Without any evidence backing their assertion, they engaged in their own information operation by signing a public letter right before the election. Their letter was actual disinformation, coming from what are supposed to be trusted former members of our U.S. intelligence Agencies. They should all be ashamed and held accountable for spreading this disinformation. By signing that disinformation letter, they reinforced false claims that the records on the laptop were not legitimate.

By casting doubt on evidence of the Bidens' corrupt practices, these former intelligence officials interfered in the 2020 election to a far greater extent than Russia could have ever hoped to achieve. Their willing accomplices in the press amplified this disinformation letter and, by doing so, were equally guilty of egregious election interference.

In August 2020, I wrote a public letter detailing the history, purpose, and goals of my oversight and investigations. In that letter, I laid out the timeline of Joe and Hunter Biden's involvement in Ukraine. The timeline is very revealing.

It starts in February 2014. That was the month of the Revolution of Dignity in Ukraine. Two months later, on April 16, 2014, then-Vice President Biden met with his son's business partner Devon Archer, now a convicted felon, at the White House.

I just want to pause and just let that sink in a little bit. Devon Archer is now a convicted felon. He got a meeting in the White House with the Vice President of the United States. That is kind of a big deal.

The press didn't ask many questions. Five days after that meeting in the

White House, April 21, Joe Biden visited Ukraine, and the media described him as the "public face of the administration's handling of Ukraine." The next day, on April 22, Devon Archer joined the board of Burisma. What a coincidence.

On April 28, 6 days later, British officials seized \$23 million from the London bank accounts of Burisma's owner Mykola Zlochevsky. Let that sink in a little bit. Six days after Devon Archer joined the board of Burisma, a day after Vice President Biden visited Ukraine, which was 5 days after he met with Devon Archer in the White House, British officials seized \$23 million from the corrupt owner of Burisma.

On May 13, 2014, 3 weeks later, Hunter Biden joined the board of Burisma. What a coincidence.

Because of the findings in our reports and the excellent investigative journalism on the part of John Solomon, we also know that Hunter was involved with Yelena Baturina, the corrupt and now-sanctioned wife of the former mayor of Moscow, during the exact same period of time.

On February 14, 2014, Baturina wired \$3.5 million to Rosemont Seneca Thornton, an investment firm co-founded by Hunter Biden.

Between April 4 and April 5, 2014—again, the same month that Joe Biden met with Devon Archer in the White House and Devon became a member of the board of Burisma—Hunter Biden and Devon Archer sent emails about meeting with Baturina, potentially relating to a business deal in Chelsea, NY.

On April 13, 2014, 9 days before Devon Archer joined the board of Burisma, Hunter Biden and Devon Archer discussed a potential deal involving Baturina. Archer wrote that Baturina "confirmed green light to fund deposit." Archer continued:

Just spent two hours on the phone with Kiev. I am confident at this point this is a good if not life changing deal if the Ukraine doesn't collapse in the meantime.

It is quite interesting to see how much significant activity involving the Bidens and corrupt actors in Russia and Ukraine occurred within a 6-week period, only 2 months after the Ukrainian Revolution of Dignity. It sure looks like they intended to cash in on the turmoil in Ukraine.

In my August 2020 letter, I listed a number of questions about then-Vice President Biden's interaction with Hunter Biden's business partner and other family members' foreign financial dealings. In making this letter public, my hope was that the press, the very uninquisitive press, would begin to ask then-Presidential candidate Joe Biden these important and legitimate questions.

It should come as no surprise that the corporate media was completely uninterested and failed to conduct any investigative journalism. Nearly 2 years after I wrote this public letter, the mainstream media has still not

adequately pressed President Biden for answers to these very legitimate questions; for example, No. 1: Why did Joe Biden meet with Devon Archer at the White House on April 16, 2014? What did they discuss? Did they discuss anything related to Ukraine, Hunter Biden, or Burisma?

No. 2, was Joe Biden aware that Devon Archer joined the board of Burisma 6 days after that meeting, 1 day after he visited Ukraine?

No. 3, does Joe Biden believe Burisma and its owner are corrupt?

No. 4, when did Joe Biden first become aware that Hunter Biden also joined the board of Burisma?

No. 5, when did Joe Biden first become aware of how much money Hunter Biden was being compensated by Burisma? Senator GRASSLEY and my report showed it was close to \$4 million.

No. 6, what does Joe Biden know about Hunter or James Biden's dealings with China?

No. 7, what does Joe Biden know about financial benefits his brother and sister-in-law have obtained because of their relationships to him?

Investigative reporter John Solomon has added a few more questions to my list, including: No. 1, what, if anything, did Joe Biden know about his son's dealings with Russian oligarch Yelena Baturina?

No. 2, a 2017 series of memos referred to a Chinese business deal that involved Hunter Biden and included a 10-percent equity for the "big guy." What did Joe Biden know about this specific deal, and who was the "big guy"?

No. 3, emails on Hunter Biden's laptop, now in the possession of the FBI, refer to shared accounts or bills between Joe Biden and Hunter. Did Hunter ever give Joe Biden any money, gift, or financial benefit from Hunter's business dealings?

After a long-overdue analysis, the New York Times and the Washington Post have finally admitted that records from Hunter's laptop are authentic, which means—although they will never admit this—that Senator GRASSLEY and I were right, and they were wrong.

It is interesting to read how limited and muted their mea culpas are. My guess is that they learned a lot from their coverage of Nixon's Watergate scandal coverup. They learned that when you have been caught in a cover-up—and that is what has happened here—you try to limit the damage by telling a little bit of the truth. In the intelligence world, this strategy is called a "limited hangout." The Watergate coconspirators called it a "modified limited hangout."

Regardless of what you call it, what the New York Times and the Washington Post are doing is not telling the whole truth. I doubt they ever will. But just in case they decide to pursue the truth with a little bit more rigor, they can use the above list of relevant questions as a good starting point for what they should be asking President Biden.

For our part, Senator GRASSLEY and I will continue to ask tough questions, review more information and records, and transparently provide that information to the American public. We intend to pursue and uncover the truth.

I will now turn the floor back over to Senator GRASSLEY for his closing remarks.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I thank Senator JOHNSON. I will just quickly say that the journalists in this town have an obligation to investigate. They have an obligation to uncover the facts and the evidence. They have failed time and again.

What has been reported recently is simply the tip of the iceberg. The question now is: Instead of accusing us of peddling Russian disinformation, will the media actually engage in true investigative journalism? Will the media act with intellectual honesty, or will the media continue to cover all this up for the Biden administration?

Now, Congress has a constitutional responsibility to engage in oversight of the executive branch. The Biden administration has been totally unresponsive to our oversight requests; specifically, requests that relate to the Biden criminal case.

Is Nicholas McQuaid recused from the Hunter Biden case? No answer from the Department. Does the Department possess FISA information on Patrick Ho, Hunter Biden's associate? The Department told a Federal court they do. They told me and Senator JOHNSON that they aren't sure. Can you imagine that?

When Hunter Biden communicated with Patrick Ho, were his communications captured by our intelligence community? Is the Biden administration intentionally withholding this material from Congress out of fear of what we will find?

In light of the Biden administration's total failure to respond to our questions, these are legitimate questions to ask. The Biden Justice Department's actions have cast a cloud over the case. The American people are rightly skeptical of the impact it may have on it.

Transparency brings accountability. This week, Senator JOHNSON and I have done what we can to bring transparency to our oversight work for the American people. We will continue to do so.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I come here with real pleasure, pride, excitement, joy, and real exuberance not often felt on the floor of the U.S. Senate because we are going to be making

history this week. As confident as I am of anything ever in the U.S. Senate happening, this week we will confirm Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson as an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Let me, first of all, thank President Biden for nominating her. His wisdom and courage are one of the reasons that she is before us as a nominee in this historic vote. And to all my fellow Members of the Judiciary Committee, we have labored a long time, through many hours, and I particularly thank Senator DURBIN for his leadership.

Now, "historic" is a word that is often overused, even in this Chamber, where a lot of history is made, but Judge Jackson's nomination truly merits that word. It is a joyous, exciting moment for all Americans because Justice Jackson will make the U.S. Supreme Court look more like America and, hopefully, think more like America at a time when Black women and people with diverse backgrounds, races, religions have broken many barriers.

Her confirmation will be a giant leap into the present. She stands on the shoulders of many who have come before her, as she recognized so explicitly in our hearing. One of them is Constance Baker Motley, a daughter of New Haven, CT, the first Black woman to argue before the U.S. Supreme Court and the first Black woman to be appointed as a judge on the U.S. district court.

Now, she was also instrumental in the well-known and profoundly significant case of *Brown v. Board of Education*, argued by Thurgood Marshall, and she won every one of the cases that she argued before the U.S. Supreme Court. I have argued four; she argued ten. Her record surpasses almost any of the litigators who have become judges.

Not only will she be the first Black woman on the U.S. Supreme Court, Justice Jackson will be the first public defender. What does that mean? She has represented people who couldn't afford a lawyer. There is nobody on this Court who has represented people who couldn't afford a lawyer as a full-time profession or public defender. She has more experience as a trial lawyer and a trial judge combined than anybody on the U.S. Supreme Court now and probably over the last century.

She has academic credentials that are superlative. She has written and taught and counseled in ways that give her insights into the real-life meaning of the law and its real impact on people.

It has also given her an emotional intelligence. There is no question that she is qualified by virtue of intellect and intelligence. Book smart—there is no question that she is book smart, but she is also people smart. She understands, as Justice Breyer has, as well, that all of these abstruse legalisms, all of the abstract concepts in law, all the technical distinctions, all of the verbiage—they have a real-life impact when they are words in a statute, when

they are words in a legal opinion, when they are words from the mouths of judges or Justices—Federal or State. She understands that real-life impact, which gives her more than intellect. It gives her emotional intelligence.

I will say that I have talked to Judge Jackson about her feelings, her instincts at critical decision points as a judge. In sentencing, when she knew that another person's life was in her hands, metaphorically, and when another person's future was within her decision-making power, she has looked at sentencing decisions with all of the data points, all of the emotional intelligence, all of the judgment that she has advanced so movingly in her conversations with us, as well as her appearance before our committee.

She has that capacity for empathy that very few people have. A lot of people can go to school and can graduate with honors. They can be book smart, but she understands the impact of law on real lives and real people. It is those people whose lives are touched by the justice system. Whether they are victims or criminal defendants or litigants dealing with personal or professional conflict, their stories shone through her conversations with us and her testimony before our committee and her enthusiasm for the law, because judges are the face and voice of justice, and representation matters.

It matters for the legitimacy and credibility of our judicial system that our judges look like America, that somebody coming into a courtroom sees that that Justice has that face and voice that can relate to them.

Judge Jackson will bring to the U.S. Supreme Court all those immensely important qualities and, certainly, she will bring a lot of patience and perseverance. She has shown those qualities, but also grace and dignity, in the way that she responded to some of the abusive, demanding questions that she was asked during our hearing. She has weathered that storm with extraordinary distinction and diligence. When some of our colleagues went low, she went high, to paraphrase Michelle Obama.

When she was attacked for not claiming a "judicial philosophy," she pointed to the decisions and opinions and disclaimed a judicial philosophy, just as Chief Justice Roberts did when he was asked in his hearing about judicial philosophy and he said he had no "overarching judicial philosophy" and, instead, described his role as "call[ing] balls and strikes."

She said she knew her lane. She does, indeed, know her lane. She maybe didn't use the same terminology, but it is that objectivity and impartiality that Chief Justice Roberts described that will also guide her as a matter of principle and philosophy.

There were other criticisms of Judge Jackson, and one conservative commentator described these attacks as "meritless to the point of demagoguery." He was right. The concocted

outrage, the straw man, the old grievances, the ancient complaints about past hearings and the treatment of nominees, all will fade and be forgotten because what shone through her performance was her integrity, her depth and warmth, her grace and dignity.

Far from being soft on crime, very movingly, she described what it is like to have a family member who walks a beat because her brother is a cop and her uncle, a chief of police. She described the worries, concerns, even fear that family members have when their relatives are police—when their brother or uncle puts himself in harm's way. And that is probably the reason she has been endorsed by the largest rank-and-file enforcement organization in the country, the Fraternal Order of Police, as well as the International Association of Chiefs of Police, high-ranking officials from the Department of Justice, and nearly 100 former assistant U.S. attorneys, many of whom observed her work as a judge firsthand.

Some may have tried to smear her, but they failed abysmally, fortunately. She had a reversal rate of about 2 percent, well below the rate that the average district judge has in the DC Circuit. And she has been endorsed, as well, by former colleagues who were appointed by Republican judges—well-respected conservative judges who disagreed with her in the outcome of cases but who deeply respected the way she called those balls and strikes in the best and truest sense of the term.

And she has shown her independence. She has ruled for and against the Trump administration. She has ruled for and against labor and collective bargaining, for and against qualified immunity, for and against class certification, because her philosophy and her "methodology," to use her word, is to follow the facts and the law, and that is what she will do as a Justice on the U.S. Supreme Court.

Let me just finish, finally, with, maybe, what I think is going to be most important about Justice Jackson.

She is a unifier and a consensus builder. She is someone who can build bridges among colleagues and even adversaries. She has been confirmed on a bipartisan basis three times already by the Senate because she is a bridge builder, and the Court needs a bridge builder now more than ever. It has been politicized and polarized in a way that undermines respect and trust in the American people. Partly, it is the self-inflicted wounds of the Court, which have been dominated in many decisions by a far-right coalition that have made it look political, and that perception is deeply important because the Court's trust and respect depend on the public perceiving it to be above politics.

So the Court has inflicted wounds on itself, but so have the Congress and the political branch inflicted wounds on the Court by dragging it through a seemingly political process and making nominations and appointments seem to

be the result of partisan politics, so that it may be perceived as just another political branch.

I said at the very start that I have reverence for the Court and deep respect for it as an institution. It has no armies or police. It has no power of the purse. Its authority depends on its credibility.

My hope is that Judge Jackson as Justice Jackson will help elevate it in a way that it needs now more than ever. I asked her about a code of ethics for the U.S. Supreme Court, and she said she would talk to her colleagues about it. I feel she has an understanding of the need now for the Court to adopt a code of ethics.

It is the only judicial body that lacks a code of ethics. It has none. Unlike the appellate courts, the district courts, the U.S. magistrate, the court of claims—all of the minor judicial bodies in the United States—it has no code of ethics because it has resisted a code of ethics. Its credibility now depends on its having a code of ethics.

Recent events have severely imperiled credibility and trust, and that peril will grow as more becomes known about some of these events. But the Court can help itself by supporting a code of ethics rather than resisting it.

Judge Jackson's commitment to talk to her colleagues about it is a very welcome and important step. She said it in response to a question that I asked. I was the only member of the committee to ask about a code of ethics—surprisingly, to me. But restoring credibility and trust will be important to our Nation. Her service will help restore and inspire confidence. Her presence and active participation on the Court will help that task of reinvigorating credibility and trust.

Her confirmation will be, indeed, a giant leap forward into the present and the future. It will inspire lots of young girls, lots of young women, lots of Black women, lots of Americans to believe in the American dream and to believe and see the law in different ways. That is what one of the young girls who wrote to Judge Jackson said in her letter, indeed, that she would look at the law in a different way.

We will look at the law in a different way, and we will look at the Court in a different way because the Court will look and hopefully think more like America.

I am looking forward to that vote. I will never cast a vote in this body that I am more proud and excited to do.

I thank all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and hopefully there will be more on the other side of the aisle joining us for this historic achievement for our Nation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, in the last few weeks, we have heard a lot about and from Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson.

I would like to start off by congratulating Judge Jackson and her family on her nomination. I had a wonderful meeting with the judge last week. She is a highly qualified attorney. I would also like to congratulate her for making it through the Senate Judiciary Committee. The hearing process can be grueling, but it is extremely important. Judge Jackson demonstrated grace under pressure. However, I have concerns about Judge Jackson's nomination and will not be supporting her confirmation to the Supreme Court.

Perhaps my greatest issue with Judge Jackson is her lack of adherence to a judicial philosophy. I have been very clear with each Supreme Court nominee since I took office that I am looking to support a nominee who prescribes to originalism. Judge Jackson explained during the Senate Judiciary hearing that she abides by a judicial "methodology" instead of a philosophy. This means, according to her, that she begins at a neutral position to understand the facts and to interpret the law, receives all the appropriate inputs, and then interprets the law.

While I would hope that all judges, no matter which court they sit on, approach their rulings from a neutral position and evaluate all applicable court filings, Judge Jackson's methodology says nothing about the way she understands and subsequently interprets the law.

In my mind, there are three areas of the law a judge must evaluate: the meaning of the Constitution, statutes, and case precedents. Different theories of interpretation sometimes lead to different answers about the meaning of each of these different areas, which is why it is vitally important to know what a Supreme Court nominee's philosophy is.

For example, Justice Breyer, whom Judge Jackson clerked for and is nominated to replace on the Court, often described his own judicial philosophy as pragmatic. As a result, Justice Breyer balances the interests and values surrounding a case.

While I don't agree with Justice Breyer's method of interpretation, Judge Jackson won't even commit to abiding by this judicial philosophy, and this is very troubling. If a Justice's legal interpretation has no philosophical grounding, that provides flexibility for a Justice to bend their thinking to achieve a desired outcome instead of following a structured analysis. We have enough politicians in the legislative branch; we don't need any in the courts, especially the Supreme Court.

My concerns with Judge Jackson's apparent lack of a judicial philosophy are magnified by her other progressive and activist choices. Case in point: her

lax stance on the sentencing of pedophiles. The laws she applied simply hold those who distribute child pornography accountable, considering how often these offenders recidivate. Instead, Judge Jackson went out of her way to articulate her discomfort with imposing sentences based upon, in her words, "outdated laws" because the nature of child pornography distribution has changed. For the children depicted in these heinous images, it really doesn't matter how they are distributed. Judge Jackson afforded leniency to offenders and previewed for all of us how she applies outdated laws to modern problems.

Going further, when asked if she supports expanding the number of Justices on the Supreme Court, Judge Jackson refused to reject that position. Perhaps echoing this thought process during the Senate Judiciary hearing, Judge Jackson commented that she would be "thrilled to be one of however many" Justices. This tells me everything I need to know.

In addition, Judge Jackson's unverified stance on life issues gives me great pause. During several exchanges at the hearing, Judge Jackson refused to acknowledge when the life of an unborn child begins. As a result, the only information I have to evaluate is her previous decision supporting a Massachusetts law that created a buffer zone preventing pro-life sidewalk counselors from approaching expectant mothers outside of abortion clinics.

Without an articulated process on how the judge would approach a life question in combination with this troubling decision, I have no reassurance that the judge will not take an activist stance. I cannot and will not accept this answer.

Finally, I am deeply concerned at Judge Jackson's response when asked to define a woman. The judge responded that she is not a biologist. Well, folks, I am not a biologist either, but it seems pretty common sense to me. I can tell you the voters of Iowa didn't have to think about the answer to this question when they elected me as the first woman to represent Iowa in the U.S. Senate. I can tell you the Taliban didn't have to think about the answer to this question when they closed the doors of schools to female students 2 weeks ago. And I can tell you President Biden didn't have to think about the answer to this question when he nominated Judge Jackson as the first Black woman to the Supreme Court.

While I am grateful Judge Jackson believes science is the basis for determining a woman, I am deeply concerned that a fellow woman who is set to define the contours of laws that are specific to women has to even think about an answer to that question.

So Judge Jackson's language, or lack thereof, speaks volumes for me, and I cannot support her nomination for a lifetime appointment on our Nation's highest Court.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, later this week, the full Senate will take up and vote on the nomination of Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Over the last several weeks, the Congress and the country and, indeed, the world have gotten to know Judge Jackson. We have learned about her broad life experience, her exceptional career, her deep love of the law.

Judge Jackson endured a verbal marathon of intense questioning from members of the Judiciary Committee. She endured challenging and sometimes specious lines of questioning from some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but through it all, she shined. She approached every moment of the hearing with grace, with wisdom, and with brilliance. Her good judgment and sharp mind were on full display for all to see. She was unshakable; she was inspiring.

If confirmed, she will make history as the first Black woman to sit on the highest Court of the land. With Judge Jackson on the top Bench, we will get one step closer to ensuring that the Supreme Court of the United States looks like the Nation it serves; and with Judge Jackson on the highest Court, we will be even closer to realizing the noble ideal inscribed on the face of the Supreme Court building: "Equal Justice Under Law."

Her confirmation will be a victory for all of America.

My State of Maryland is also proud to have a small connection with Judge Jackson. Not only did she reside in Maryland for a period of time, but her brother served on the Baltimore Police Department for 7 years, and he has also served two tours of duty as a member of the Maryland National Guard. Other members of her family also pursued careers in public service. Two of her uncles were police officers, and her parents were public school teachers.

Like her family members, Ketanji Brown Jackson has taken up the mantle of public service as a public defender, as a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission, as a district court judge, and as a Federal circuit court judge.

It is no mystery as to why her nomination has been met with widespread praise. She has been lauded by the Fraternal Order of Police and by the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Prominent Republican-appointed judges and lawyers have spoken in favor of her confirmation. The American Bar Association listed her as

"well-qualified" for the position to which she has been nominated—their highest rating.

There is no question in my mind that she will serve our Nation well and with distinction as the newest Justice of the Supreme Court, and I will vote in favor of her confirmation this week, proudly.

I have watched many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle strain to find some justification for voting against Judge Jackson. They know she is highly qualified. They know she is a person of integrity. They know she has the training and judgment required of a Supreme Court Justice.

Last week, one Republican member of the Senate Judiciary Committee called Judge Jackson a "person of exceptionally good character, respected by her peers, and someone who has worked hard to achieve her current position."

Another Republican member of the committee noted that she had "impeccable credentials and a deep knowledge of the law."

You would think these were words leading up to state support for Judge Jackson, but in both of those cases, those Senators have announced their decisions to vote against her. The pattern is the same for too many of our Republican colleagues. They come out and praise Judge Jackson and then announce they are voting against her.

So the question is, Why? What is the reasoning here? And I have been listening carefully.

Many of our colleagues tie their opposition to what they have called her "judicial philosophy." They say Judge Jackson will push her own political ideology at the expense of the law. They say she is going to be an activist instead of a judge. They say she will create "new rights from the Constitution out of whole cloth." In fact, that was a quote from my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas, who took to the floor last week in opposing Judge Jackson's confirmation.

When my friend from Texas made that statement, I happened to be sitting where the Presiding Officer is right now, as I was presiding over the Senate, and I listened very closely to his arguments and others that were made along similar lines. None of the claims that I have heard hold water when you look at the facts because here is what Judge Jackson herself said during her confirmation hearing when asked about judicial restraint:

I am acutely aware that, as a judge in our system, I have limited power, and I am trying in every case to stay in my lane.

This is not just a hollow promise. Judge Jackson has explained to this Senate her clear methodology for ruling on cases to ensure that she stays in her lane. The methodology is simple.

Step 1, start from a position of neutrality.

We have all seen the scales of justice. We want them to be evenly balanced. Everybody who walks into a court should get a fair shot. That is step 1.

Step 2, evaluate all of the facts from various perspectives.

Step 3, apply the law to those facts. That is it. She was clear. That is how she makes decisions. That is how she rules from the bench.

So what about the Constitution itself, that great document? What about this notion that she would be a runaway Justice, "creating new rights from the Constitution out of whole cloth"—to use the language, the expression, of some of my colleagues.

That, too, is just plain wrong.

Here is Judge Jackson again when she said:

I believe that the Constitution is fixed in its meaning. I believe it is appropriate to look at the original intent, original public meaning of the words when one is trying to assess because, again, that is a limitation on my authority to import my own policy.

Judge Jackson understands the boundaries of her authority as a judge. She has stayed within those boundaries for over a decade on the Federal bench.

So enough of the spurious arguments that she is going to be an activist on the Court. Her method is clear; it is fair; it is balanced and honest, and I am confident that her rulings will be clear, fair, balanced, and honest.

Let's not forget this: There are certain rights that most Americans would acknowledge are central to our Nation's traditions and values but that are not specifically and expressly enumerated in the Constitution, not each and every one with its own sentence.

I have a short list here: the right to travel, the right to vote, the right to privacy, the right to marry. None of these rights are explicitly, expressly referenced in the text of the Constitution, but all of them have been derived by a close analysis of the letter and spirit of our Constitution and laws. These are rights we all embrace. These are rights the American people don't want elected officials to be able to take away from them.

Let's not forget that the First Amendment, as written, only protects Americans from Federal action, from congressional action, that would violate their right to freedom of religion, press, speech, and assembly.

Over time, the Court has taken action to protect these rights in the face of all government action, whether Federal or State or local, to make sure that those rights are protected against all government action no matter what its source.

Justices appointed by Presidents of both parties have worked to protect rights Americans hold dear.

President Reagan's appointee Justice Anthony Kennedy wrote the majority opinion in the case of *Obergefell v. Hodges*, which protects the rights of same-sex couples to marry. His fellow Reagan appointee Sandra Day O'Connor joined the majority in the case of *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, which reaffirmed the reproductive liberties guaranteed under *Roe v. Wade*.

Let's be clear: The Supreme Court considers the most challenging ques-

tions in American law. Judge Jackson will have to take on these challenging questions, like her peers on the Court, if she is confirmed; but one thing is crystal clear from her testimony and from the record: She will apply the law based on the facts. She will not be a partisan in a robe. She will be a fair, independent Justice of the Supreme Court, and she is very deserving of that title.

I had the great privilege of meeting with Judge Jackson just yesterday. During our conversation, I was struck, again, by her brilliance, her intelligence, her kindness, and resolve. That came across on television during the hearings, but it was very evident in our one-on-one meeting. I thought about another Supreme Court nominee who broke barriers nearly 55 years ago, a man from Baltimore, MD: Thurgood Marshall. He was the first Black man to serve on the Supreme Court of the United States.

So, during my conversation with Judge Jackson, I invited her to join me in West Baltimore at P.S. 103. This is public school building 103. It is in West Baltimore. It is the school where Thurgood Marshall learned to read and write. It is no longer an active school. The building is in bad condition. Just this year, as part of the omnibus appropriations bill, Senator CARDIN and I were able to secure some Federal funds to help renovate that building and to turn it into a living memorial to Justice Thurgood Marshall and to expand opportunities for people in West Baltimore. So I told Judge Jackson that once she gets settled, it would be a great honor and privilege to bring her, the first Black woman on the Supreme Court, to the place where the first Black man on the Court grew up and went to school.

Justice Thurgood Marshall inspired a generation of leaders and public servants to enter the legal field. Soon, Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson will do the same. Young people from all across our country will look at the Supreme Court of the United States and feel more included. Her presence on the Court will be a victory for "we the people."

In 1978, Justice Thurgood Marshall said to a group of university graduates:

This is your democracy. Make it. Protect it. Pass it on.

I am deeply honored to work alongside my colleagues in the Senate to advance that vision, as we all strive to form a more perfect Union. And there is no doubt in my mind—no doubt at all—that elevating Judge Jackson to Justice Jackson will make our Union a little more perfect.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 659, Katherine Vidal,

to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office; that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Katherine Vidal, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Vidal nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter to the Senate Archivist be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE EMERITUS,
Washington, DC, April 1, 2022.

KAREN D. PAUL,
Senate Archivist, Senate Historical Office,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. PAUL: I understand that you have been charged with implementing a provision in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022 that offered a very limited number of senators up to \$2.5 million each for the preservation of their records. This is a shocking amount of money, well beyond what could possibly be necessary for processing and preserving records, even for long serving senators with a lot of records. On September 22, 2021, my staff alerted the Senate Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee of my decision not to accept any of the funding being proposed. It was my understanding at that time that the Appropriations Committee would reduce the funding appropriated accordingly.

With a budget deficit for the current fiscal year expected to be well over \$1 Trillion, and ballooning debt that is on pace to reach an all-time record as a share of our economy within 10 years, spending millions of taxpayer dollars on a handful of senators'

records cannot be justified. The tradition in the Senate is for academic institutions to agree to store and manage former senators' records as part of their academic mission. Some senators seek to go beyond simple preservations of records and establish centers to perpetuate their legacy. However, funds for new facilities or other functions beyond simply storing records are traditionally raised privately. The taxpayers should NOT be on the hook for senators' legacy projects. As a working senator, I am not focused on my legacy. I often say that my legacy will be decided by historians decades into the future with the benefit of hindsight. As such, my legacy is not something I can or should worry about.

Again, I did not seek these funds and I oppose their expenditure. I ask that you not transmit paperwork to the future repository of my records. I also ask that any funding that is eligible to be spent on the preservation of my records remain in the Treasury to reduce the deficit.

Sincerely,

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
United States Senator.

PS: Read and signed by this Senator.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise today in support of the nomination of Ketanji Brown Jackson to be an Associate Justice on the U.S. Supreme Court. I have had the privilege of serving in this body for nearly three decades now.

In that time, I have participated in the confirmation hearings of 10 Supreme Court Justices and hundreds of nominees to our Federal circuit and district courts. I have carefully scrutinized Judge Jackson's record and listened very closely to her testimony. In my view, Judge Jackson is both well qualified and extremely prepared to take on the important role of serving on the U.S. Supreme Court.

Judge Jackson is a graduate of both Harvard University and Harvard Law School, a former Supreme Court clerk, a former Federal public defender, and a former U.S. Sentencing Commissioner. On top of that, Judge Jackson has served as a federal judge for nearly a decade.

Judge Jackson would be the first Federal public defender to sit on the Supreme Court and the first Justice since Thurgood Marshall with significant experience representing low-income defendants in criminal cases. As a former public defender, Judge Jackson truly understands the power of our constitutional rights, including the Sixth Amendment right to counsel and the Fifth Amendment right to due process. Judge Jackson would also join Justice Sotomayor as the only former Federal district court judges serving on the Supreme Court.

What has impressed me most about Judge Jackson does not appear on her resume. That is Judge Jackson's steadfast commitment to the fair and impartial application of the law, her deep knowledge of the U.S. Constitution, and her remarkable judicial temperament. These qualities were dem-

onstrated in her testimony before the Judiciary Committee earlier this month. They were also shown in the letters and testimony of the many people—of all ideological viewpoints—who have supported Judge Jackson's nomination.

First, Judge Jackson's respect for the law and the Constitution are clear from the nearly 600 legal opinions she has drafted as a Federal judge. Her legal opinions are clear and detailed. As she explained during her confirmation hearings, Judge Jackson carefully and fairly applies the law to the specific facts of each case. And Judge Jackson takes the time to explain why she reached each decision. In my view, it is important that the decisions of the Supreme Court are accessible to the American people. Judge Jackson's approach to judicial decision-making will help to ensure transparency in her judging and help to restore the public's confidence in the decisions of the Supreme Court.

Second, Judge Jackson clearly has deep legal knowledge. During her more than 20 hours of testimony before the Judiciary Committee, she spoke with skill on a wide range of topics. She addressed legal issues of all kinds, including separation of powers, the First Amendment, administrative law, criminal sentencing, and much more. I believe Judge Jackson has the knowledge and expertise to decide the most difficult and pressing legal issues facing this Nation.

Finally, during her hearings, Judge Jackson also showed that she has a remarkable temperament. Lawyers and judges who have worked with her, or appeared before her, have confirmed that Judge Jackson brings this temperament with her in all aspects of her work. They have told the Senate that she is as collegial, calm, and steadfast as she appeared to be during her hearings.

For example, Judge Thomas Griffith testified in support of Judge Jackson's nomination and focused on her character and temperament, in addition to her exceptional qualifications. Judge Griffith is a retired judge of the D.C. Circuit and was appointed to the bench by President George W. Bush. Judge Griffith said that Judge Jackson has modeled the ideal qualities of a judge, including diligence, carefulness, high character, deep legal knowledge, and broad experience.

Witnesses from the American Bar Association also testified about Judge Jackson's sterling reputation for integrity. Those witnesses interviewed lawyers and judges who have known and worked with Judge Jackson at various points over the course of her career. And, in those interviews, lawyers and judges who were familiar with Judge Jackson uniformly praised her character. They called her "first rate," "impeccable," and "beyond reproach." One comment said: "You write the word 'integrity,' and then you put her initials next to it."

The American Bar Association's interviews also revealed that prosecutors and defense attorneys alike regard Judge Jackson as fair, balanced, and unbiased. She is precisely the kind of Justice we need on the Supreme Court. Judge Jackson is plainly up to the task of faithfully interpreting our Constitution and our laws and fairly applying the law in each and every case.

Judge Jackson laid out in simple terms the three-part methodology she uses in each case to ensure that her decisions are informed by the arguments of the parties, the facts, and the law, and not by any personal views she may hold. Judge Jackson's thoughtful methodology shows that she appreciates how important it is for judges to approach each and every case with an open mind and to avoid both actual and perceived conflicts of interest.

I believe Judge Jackson is an extraordinary person. Her rich family history in law enforcement and her background as a Federal public defender, a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission, a trial judge, and an appellate judge will benefit our Supreme Court.

It will be my great pleasure to vote to confirm Judge Jackson to be an Associate Justice on the Supreme Court. And I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will do the same.

TRIBUTE TO ERIC CIOPPA

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise today to honor Eric Cioppa, the superintendent of the Maine Bureau of Insurance, who recently retired after more than three decades of distinguished public service to the State of Maine. Throughout his time at the bureau, Eric's leadership and service have benefited all Mainers and have contributed to the financial health of Mainers.

Eric joined the bureau in 1988 as a statistician before being named supervisor of the workers' compensation section. I had the pleasure of working directly with Eric when I was commissioner of the Maine Department of Professional and Financial Regulation. In 1998, he was promoted to deputy superintendent and was then appointed to the position of superintendent of the Maine Bureau of Insurance by Governor Paul LePage in 2011, a position to which he was unanimously confirmed, and then reconfirmed in 2017 to serve another 5-year term.

Throughout his service as superintendent, Eric's work has touched the lives of nearly every citizen in Maine. His tireless commitment to protecting insurance consumers, while also supporting ongoing competition and innovation in Maine's insurance industry, will leave a lasting positive impact on the State. Furthermore, numerous Governors have benefited from Eric's guidance and expertise on a wide range of insurance issues for decades, and his deep knowledge of Maine's insurance industry will be missed by all policymakers.

Outside of Maine, Eric has been heavily involved in helping to set national priorities and developing new laws and regulations through his longtime service with the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, NAIC. At NAIC, he has served as the association's president, vice president, and secretary, among other positions. Attributable to his stellar reputation, Eric was appointed by his peers at NAIC to serve a 2-year term as the State insurance commissioner representative on the Financial Stability Oversight Council in 2018 and was re-elected for another 2-year term in 2020.

Eric has also been an invaluable resource for me on insurance issues going back to my time as commissioner of the Maine Department of Professional and Financial Regulation. Throughout my service in the Senate, Eric has continued to provide wise counsel and advice to both me and my staff, and his wisdom and insight will be greatly missed.

Eric exemplifies the ideal public servant, and there is no doubt that Mainers are better off because of his longtime dedication to protecting and serving the public. I wish him and his family all the best as they embark on their next chapter.

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND KEN DEGROOT AND SISTER MELANIE MACZKA

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, I rise today to honor the lives, careers, and achievements of Reverend Ken DeGroot and Sister Melanie Maczka. Together, Reverend Ken and Sister Melanie created the Casa ALBA Melanie a community center dedicated to serving the Hispanic population of the greater Green Bay area. Through Casa ALBA Melanie, and their ministerial service, Reverend Ken and Sister Melanie have welcomed members of the Hispanic community to our State with open arms for over 25 years.

It was 1991 when Reverend Ken first encountered the mission which would encompass the rest of his career. Two young men, fresh off the train from Mexico and at his doorstep, were tired, hungry, and could not speak English. Far from home and looking for a house of worship, Reverend Ken welcomed them into St. Willebrord parish. He decided that night that Green Bay could be the home they searched for.

They would find they were not alone. Thousands of people from Central and South America already lived in their community, working in a world where they could not speak the language. Today, it is estimated that at least 20,500 Hispanics live in the greater Green Bay area, and about 28 percent of the Green Bay school population is Hispanic. Alongside Sister Melanie, Reverend Ken decided things had to change. They traveled to Mexico, visiting villages, learning the culture and language of the neighbors they had never known they had. When they re-

turned to Green Bay, they knew they could work to better serve the Hispanic community.

In 2012, Reverend Ken and Sister Melanie established Casa ALBA Melanie and transformed the quality of life for Hispanic families by providing legal assistance, health services, language acquisition, Spanish GED lessons, financial assistance, and, perhaps most importantly, a safe haven for Green Bay's Spanish speaking residents.

This year, Casa ALBA Melanie celebrates its 10-year anniversary and with this great celebration comes a change in leadership. Reverend Ken, who has served as chair of the development committee and the finance committee, and Sister Melanie who has served as executive director, will both retire from the impactful organization they helped guide over this past decade. Their work is an inspiration to all people seeking to create a more equitable and welcoming America.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Reverend Ken DeGroot and Sister Melanie Maczka for their leadership at Casa ALBA Melanie and throughout the greater Green Bay community.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING LANE R. WILLIAMS

• Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, along with my colleagues Senator and Representative RUSS FULCHER, I recognize the life of an extraordinary Idahoan, Lane R. Williams, who passed away in February. Lane was the former owner of Midvale Telephone Exchange and is remembered for his commitment to advancing opportunities for others. This includes his role in keeping the Weiser area north to McCall connected through his telephone company.

His obituary reads, "Lane left behind a legacy of championing the underdog and empowering people by creating possibilities and opportunities. He did this in part by being an educator of many, including years spent working with migrant workers as a teacher. He always believed that education was the key to empowerment." In 1977, Lane took over Midvale Telephone Exchange from his parents and, with his wife Mary Gaile, began expanding service to five Idaho communities and to the remote Cascabel community in southern Arizona before building four additional areas throughout Arizona. This expansion is credited with enabling more than 4,000 people in rural areas to have internet and phone service and employing over 45 people. In 2008, Lane created an employee stock ownership plan, ESOP, and sold the company to his employees to help ensure their continued employment and security in retirement.

Lane was one of those industrious and inspiring people who figure out ways to help and encourage improvements in their community, and do

them. Some years after his beloved wife Mary Gaile passed, he met his wife Elsa Freeman, who again enlightened his life with love and companionship. The two bought and restored the Midvale Mercantile. The project's benefits to the community include, providing jobs, a local grocery source, community kitchen, community garden, and lodging for travelers. They also started Midvale Marketplace, Inc., a nonprofit focused on identifying community needs; creating service, education, and employment opportunities; and developing and supporting sustainable economic growth. Lane was also instrumental in developing the Weiser River Trail, and worked hard to maintain and improve the park and trail.

As we recognize the good Lane Williams did for his treasured community of Midvale and far beyond, we extend our deep condolences to Lane's friends and loved ones, including his wife Elsa Freeman, children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. His love, compassion, and open-heartedness will endure in the many lives he touched during his life well lived.●

RECOGNIZING IDAHO'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES

● Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, along with my colleagues Senator JIM RISCH, Representative MIKE SIMPSON, and Representative RUSS FULCHER, we honor Idaho's community colleges during this Community College Month.

In order to meet the needs of a competitive job market, the importance of providing Idahoans with the opportunity to enhance their education has grown tremendously. Idaho's four community colleges are a central part of preparing young people and adults for postsecondary education, successful careers, and productive lives.

Our community colleges not only link students to Idaho's 4-year institutions through cooperative agreements, but also provide dual enrollment opportunities for students pursuing advanced learning while in high school through partnerships with the K-12 sector. Through collaboration with Idaho's business community, Idaho's community colleges also help grow the skillset necessary to prepare students for Idaho's workforce.

The recognition of April as Community College Month by the American Association of Community Colleges and the Association of Community College Trustees provides an opportunity to spotlight the valued role of Idaho's community colleges in enhancing Idahoans' quality of life and contributing to Idaho's economic success. We commend Idaho's community colleges and the educators who inform and inspire through these local assets for being a conduit for opportunities for so many Idahoans.●

TRIBUTE TO OFFICER SAMANTHA FAORO

● Mr. PAUL. Madam President, we have all heard the phrase "law enforcement family." This law enforcement family is a diverse family with representatives from all walks of life. This family is not bound by traditions of race, religion, color, or sex. This family is all inclusive. Today, I want to provide an example of this family and how they came together to save the life of a fellow law enforcement officer.

On January 28, 2022, Kentucky State Police Trooper Michael Sanguini was shot multiple times while conducting a traffic stop in Harrison County. According to the preliminary investigation, he was struck six times, of which three shots were stopped by his ballistic vest. One shot struck his portable radio, and another struck his issued taser, with one shot striking his body.

Although many officers from multiple agencies responded to assist the injured trooper, I want to recognize Kentucky Fish and Wildlife Officer Samantha Faoro for her quick response and actions of assistance. Officer Samantha Faoro is a native of Colorado, who moved to Kentucky to pursue her career with the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife. She graduated from the police academy in February 2021 and was assigned to work in Harrison County. Officer Faoro comes from a family of first responders, continuing the life of service to protect the great Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Officer Faoro was working in the area of Cynthiana, KY, when she heard Trooper Sanguini state he had been shot. Without hesitation, Officer Faoro responded directly to the scene to provide assistance to a fellow officer in need. Upon arrival to the scene, she observed the wounded trooper and quickly transported him to the hospital. Trooper Sanguini quickly received medical treatment for his gunshot wounds because of the quick action of Officer Faoro.

It is my privilege to stand here today and recognize another great officer such as Officer Samantha Faoro. She exemplifies the law enforcement motto, "To Protect, and To Serve."●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Swann, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:15 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1916. An act to provide health insurance benefits for outpatient and inpatient items and services related to the diagnosis and treatment of a congenital anomaly or birth defect.

H.R. 5657. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to make marijuana accessible for use by qualified marijuana researchers for medical purposes, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1916. An act to provide health insurance benefits for outpatient and inpatient items and services related to the diagnosis and treatment of a congenital anomaly or birth defect; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 4008. A bill to provide COVID relief for restaurants, gyms, minor league sports teams, border businesses, live venue service providers, exclave businesses, and providers of transportation services.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 5, 2022, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 3294. An act to obtain and direct the placement in the Capitol or on the Capitol Grounds of a statue to honor Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Sandra Day O'Connor and a statue to honor Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-125. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of New Jersey urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to enact the "CARE for Kids Act of 2019"; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 84

Whereas, School meals are critical to children's health and well-being and ensure that children have the nutrition they need to effectively learn throughout the school day; and

Whereas, Research shows that receiving free school meals reduces food insecurity, obesity rates, and poor health among children; and

Whereas, The federal School Breakfast Program (SBP) and the federal National

School Lunch Program (NSLP) provide nutritionally balanced, free school meals to millions of American children each school day; and

Whereas, Under the SBP and NSLP, children may be determined categorically eligible for free school meals through participation in certain federal assistance programs, such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or based on the child's status as a homeless, migrant, runaway, or foster child; and

Whereas, Under the SBP and NSLP, children from families with incomes at or below 130 percent of the federal poverty level are eligible for free school meals; and

Whereas, Many children are excluded from categorical eligibility to receive free school meals because they have moved out of the foster care system and are in the care of grandparents or other relatives who have adopted them or have become their legal guardians; and

Whereas, More than 7.8 million children under the age of 18 live in homes where the householders are grandparents or relatives other than their parents; and

Whereas, The federal "Caregivers Access and Responsible Expansion (CARE) for Kids Act of 2019," introduced by United States Senator Bob Casey (D-PA), provides automatic eligibility for free school meals to children being raised by a relative who receives adoption or guardianship assistance; to children being raised by grandparents or other relatives due to placement by a state or tribal welfare agency; and to children living in "grandfamily" housing or receiving housing assistance under the "Native American Housing and Self-Determination Act of 1996"; and

Whereas, It is altogether fitting and proper to urge the President and Congress of the United States to enact the "CARE for Kids Act of 2019," to automatically provide free school meals to American children who are being raised by grandparents or relatives other than their parents; now, therefore, who are being raised by grandparents or relatives other than their parents; now, therefore, Be It

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey:

1. This resolution urges the President and Congress of the United States to enact the "CARE for Kids Act of 2019," to provide automatic eligibility for free school meals to American children who are being raised by grandparents or relatives other than their parents.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Secretary of the Senate to the President of the United States, Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the United States Congress elected from this State.

POM-126. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Colorado memorializing its support for Colorado to be the permanent location for the United States Space Command, and, in connection therewith, urging the Department of Defense to keep the United States Space Command in Colorado; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 22-1012

Whereas, Our nation and the world have significantly benefitted from technological and scientific advances resulting from space exploration and aerospace activities, and Colorado is paving the way for new discoveries in the frontiers of space by having a rich history in aerospace development and being at the forefront of space travel, exploration, and aerospace research; and

Whereas, Colorado is the acting provisional Space Command Base and it will remain the provisional base until 2023. Colorado is also the center for United States military space operations and strategy. According to the Colorado Space Coalition (CSC), the state's military commands are the primary customers for space-based research, development, acquisitions, and operations, representing nearly 90 percent of space-related expenditure by the military. Moving the United States Space Command (USSP ACECOM) to Huntsville, Alabama, will be incredibly disruptive to the National Defense Strategy. In addition, it will cause a major upheaval in existing infrastructure and jobs in the state, which will result in higher costs and less efficient outcomes for the United States military; and

Whereas, Colorado is strategically located at the center of our national and space defense. We are the home to five key strategic military commands: North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD), United States Northern Command (USNORTHCOM), United States Strategic Command's Joint Functional Component Command for Space (JFCC Space) Missile Warning Center, the United States Air Force Space Command, and the United States Army Space and Missile Defense Command/Army Forces Strategic Command; and five military installations, including United States Space Force bases Buckley, Peterson, and Schriever, United States Space Force Station Cheyenne Mountain, as well as Fort Carson Army Base; and

Whereas, The Space Delta Four at Buckley Space Force Base provides operational command and control of three constellations to space-based infrared missile warning systems, has been defending America continuously since 1970, and is a critical part of global defense and national security; and

Whereas, Colorado leads the charge in bringing current and future global positioning system (GPS) assets to life, a service provided free to the world by Air Force Space Command in Colorado Springs. From the operation of GPS satellites by Schriever Space Force Base to GPS III, the most powerful GPS satellite to date—being designed and built by Lockheed Martin and launched by United Launch Alliance with Raytheon developing the command and control capabilities, and with companies such as Boeing, Harris Corporation, Braxton Technologies, and Infinity Systems Engineering also supporting GPS development and operations from locations in Colorado, GPS technologies enable an integral part of our global economy to have an incalculable impact that has improved the everyday lives of billions of people around the world; and

Whereas, Colorado's aerospace industry is home to a broad range of companies that create products and systems for commercial, military, and civil space applications, such as spacecraft, launch vehicles, satellites, command and control software, sensors, and navigation operations. These companies include Ball Aerospace, Boeing, DigitalGlobe, Harris Corporation, Lockheed Martin Space Systems, Northrop Grumman, Raytheon, Sierra Nevada Corporation, Teledyne Brown Engineering, and United Launch Alliance, which make up a large portion of the aerospace sector; and

Whereas, Colorado has an existing educated workforce, ranked second in the nation with residents with a bachelor's degree or higher, and a pipeline of higher education institutions to sustain future growth. We are home to the United States Air Force Academy and many colleges and universities, including the University of Colorado Boulder and the University of Colorado Colorado Springs, Colorado School of Mines, Colorado

State University, Metropolitan State University of Denver, University of Denver, Colorado Mesa University, and Fort Lewis College. Altogether, they provide access to world-class aerospace-related degrees and offer aerospace companies one of the country's most educated workforces; and

Whereas, Colorado is home to some amazing research institutions. These institutions include the prestigious Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics (LASP) at the University of Colorado Boulder. It began in 1948, a decade before NASA, and is the world's only research institute to have sent instruments to all eight planets and to Pluto, combining all aspects of space exploration through science, engineering, mission operations, and scientific data analysis; and

Whereas, Colorado is also home to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) Space Weather Prediction Center, a world-leading center of predictions for the solar and near-Earth space environment and the nation's official source of watches, warnings, and alerts of incoming solar storms, using satellite observations to protect and save lives and property; and

Whereas, Various organizations are key to Colorado's prominence in aerospace, such as the Colorado Space Coalition, a group of industry stakeholders working to make Colorado a center of excellence for aerospace; the Colorado Space Business Roundtable, working to bring together aerospace stakeholders from the industry, government, and academia for roundtable discussions and business development and to encourage grassroots citizen participation in aerospace issues; the Colorado chapter of Citizens for Space Exploration, whose mission is to promote better understanding of aerospace and its importance in our economy and daily lives, as well as to promote the importance of human space exploration; Manufacturer's Edge, a statewide manufacturing assistance center that encourages the strength and competitiveness of Colorado manufacturers by providing on-site technical assistance through coaching, training, and consulting, by providing collaboration-focused industry programs, and by leveraging government, university, and economic development partnerships; and the Space Foundation, founded in 1983, with its world headquarters in Colorado Springs, Colorado, which holds an annual Space Symposium, bringing together civil, commercial, and national security space leaders from around the world to discuss, address, and plan for the future of space; and

Whereas, For the aforementioned reasons, it is in the best interests of the American taxpayer to keep USSP/ACECOM in the state because Colorado is already fulfilling the mission of the USSP/ACECOM; because Colorado Springs has in place the community infrastructure capacity and community support to champion an expanding mission; because the move will cost the United States billions of dollars to relocate the facility; and because the move would severely disrupt the Colorado aerospace industry, which has grown to support the mission; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Seventy-third General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the Senate concurring herein:

That we, the members of the General Assembly:

(1) Recognizing Colorado's unique blend of military installations and major commands, private aerospace companies, academic and research institutions, and government entities, and the valuable synergies this ecosystem produces, strongly urge the Department of Defense and the Biden-Harris administration to reevaluate the merits of this irresponsible decision and should rightly conclude that it is the correct decision to keep

the existing United States Space Command in Colorado;

(2) Furthermore, strongly urge the Department of Defense and the presidential administration to permanently base USSP ACECOM in Colorado, recognizing that Colorado provides the existing command structure, base infrastructure, and communications platforms necessary to successfully host additional national security initiatives and ensure coordination of efforts without committing additional funds;

(3) Proudly express that Colorado has deep ties with the Department of Defense and immense patriotic commitment to providing for the nation's security and bolstering our defense;

(4) Express our most sincere and deepest appreciation to our service members and civilian employees working in and supporting military and civilian aerospace companies, military installations, and civil organizations in Colorado; and

(5) Hereby declare Colorado to be the prime location for the permanent headquarters for USSP/ACECOM. Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this House Joint Resolution be sent to President Joseph R. Biden, Jr.; Vice President Kamala Harris; Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi; Congressman Kevin McCarthy; Senator Chuck Schumer; Senator Mitch McConnell; Senator Michael Bennet; Senator John Hickenlooper; Congresswoman Diana DeGette; Congresswoman Lauren Boebert; Congressman Jason Crow; Congressman Joe Neguse; Congressman Ken Buck; Congressman Doug Lamborn; Congressman Ed Perlmutter; Bill Nelson, NASA Administrator; Pam Melroy, NASA Deputy Administrator; Steve Dickson, Federal Aviation Administration Administrator; Governor Jared Polis; Lieutenant Governor Dianne Primavera; Brig. Gen. Laura Clellan, The Adjutant General, Colorado National Guard; Wayne R. Monteith, Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation at the Federal Aviation Administration; General John W. "Jay" Raymond, Air Force Space Commander; Colonel Jacob Middleton, USAF, Commander Aerospace Data Facility-Colorado; Dr. Christopher Scolese, Director, National Reconnaissance Office; Ross Garelick Bell, Executive Director, Aerospace States Association; Thomas E. Zelibor, Chief Executive Officer, Space Foundation; Dr. Ronald Sega, Co-chair, Colorado Space Coalition; Michael Gass, Co-chair, Colorado Space Coalition; and Bob Cone, Chair, Colorado Citizens For Space Exploration.

POM-127. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of West Virginia urging the current presidential administration to open federal lease sales onshore and offshore, supporting critical energy infrastructure to safely deliver energy produced in West Virginia, and ensuring American energy companies can access the capital they need to hire American workers; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 55

Whereas, All West Virginia residents deserve access to affordable and reliable energy, whether electricity, natural gas, or transportation fuels; and

Whereas, West Virginians are currently dealing with the highest inflation in over 40 years, with energy costs rising 29 percent, and gasoline surging 50 percent, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; and

Whereas, The current administration is pursuing a policy placing the United States at the mercy of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries and Russia to meet our domestic needs, harming our national and economic security; and

Whereas, Foreign oil imports from Russia surged more than 20 percent providing over

\$16 billion to Russia in 2021, according to the U.S. Energy Information Agency; and

Whereas, The current administration has frozen federal lease sales for American energy resources onshore and offshore while cancelling critical energy infrastructure projects like the KeystoneXL pipeline which would have reduced our dependence on Russian oil imports; and

Whereas, The current administration is actively litigating against its obligations to issue lease sales on federal lands and waters required under federal law; and

Whereas, The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has continually delayed important decisions on permits for pipelines across the country and has recently issued new harmful policy statements that could further delay and impede critical domestic energy infrastructure from being developed, depriving West Virginia access to energy markets outside of our state; and

Whereas, The Securities and Exchange Commission is designing rules to discourage investment in domestic oil and natural gas companies which may further impede production and opportunities for West Virginians; and

Whereas, The Environmental Protection Agency has not issued a decision on West Virginia's application for Class VI primacy that would allow West Virginia to safely utilize long-term storage in conjunction with state energy development; therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia: That the Legislature hereby respectfully urges the current Presidential Administration to open federal lease sales onshore and offshore, supporting critical energy infrastructure to safely deliver energy produced in West Virginia, and ensuring American energy companies can access the capital they need to hire American workers; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the Senate is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Department of Energy, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the White House National Climate Advisor, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore and Secretary of the United States Senate, the members of the West Virginia Congressional Delegation, and the news media of West Virginia.

POM-128. A memorial adopted by the Senate of the State of Arizona urging the United States Congress to implement legislation to strengthen the United States and Arizona electrical grids; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE MEMORIAL NO. 1003

Whereas, the United States electrical grid is divided into three parts, all of which are extremely vulnerable to attack by electromagnetic pulse (EMP), hacking, physical assault, severe electrical storms or damage by a natural solar event; and

Whereas, a nuclear EMP attack would have devastating consequences to our nation, as congressional studies estimate that such an attack on the Eastern United States power grid would result in a 90% death rate over a one-year period. Further, the United States military is 99% dependent on civilian electricity, and such an attack could severely hinder our nation's defense capabilities; and

Whereas, in addition to the threat of enemy attack, the sun has already hit North America twice with devastating electrical force that caused major upheaval in infrastructure elements, in 1859 and again in 1989; and

Whereas, the next natural solar event or enemy attack on our nation's power grids

could potentially disrupt numerous United States industries and services, including the military, banking, farming, fuel delivery, water and sewage services, hospitals, emergency services, communications and manufacturing; and

Whereas, none of the United States grids are currently EMP-protected at all, and basic protection has been estimated in a 2004 Congressional Report to cost \$2 billion; and

Whereas, protecting our nation's vital infrastructure, including its electrical grids, is a valid function of the United States and state governments that benefits all citizens; and

Whereas, China, Russia and Israel have already strengthened their electrical grids to limit damage and to restore power after an attack or natural solar flare; and

Whereas, terrorist countries are known to be testing and preparing super-EMP weapons, naming our nation as a target. If an enemy launched an attack from sea or space, the United States would not soon know who attacked us and could not easily retaliate; and

Whereas, over the years, Congress and several states have studied these threats, yet to date no legislation has been passed requiring the strengthening of our electrical grids. It is imperative that the current Congress expeditiously enact comprehensive legislation that will protect our nation's vital electrical grids from EMP threats, both natural and man-made.

Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, prays:

1. That the United States Congress promptly enact comprehensive legislation to strengthen the United States and Arizona electrical grids.

2. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit copies of this Memorial to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and each Member of Congress from the State of Arizona.

POM-129. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan urging the United States Congress to support legislation to strengthen the Workforce Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC); to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 198

Whereas, The Workforce Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC) encourages businesses to hire employees in certain groups that face significant barriers to employment. The credit helps to defer the costs of recruiting, training, and employing these individuals; and

Whereas, Since its creation, the WOTC has not kept up-to-date with rising labor costs. The maximum credit amount has not been updated since the credit was created in 1996, limiting its effectiveness in incentivizing businesses to hire individuals from the targeted groups; and

Whereas, The economic effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic have made it more important than ever to strengthen the WOTC. The credit targets jobs to those groups that have been disproportionately impacted by the pandemic. Increasing the credit amount will also help businesses to recover from the pandemic by defraying the costs of hiring these individuals as labor costs rise; and

Whereas, Legislation has been introduced to strengthen the WOTC. H.R. 3449 of 2021, also known as the Hiring Incentive to Return Employment (HIRE) Act, would temporarily increase the credit amount for all targeted groups for two years. The bill would also eliminate the credit's prohibition on rehiring employees for this two-year period; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we urge Congress to support legislation

to strengthen the Workforce Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC); and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, and the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-130. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of New Jersey condemning the November 1984 anti-Sikh violence in India as genocide; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 142

Whereas, The Sikh community in the United States and New Jersey has recovered from the material damages of the genocide as they continue to keep the memory of those who were killed alive and will never forget the Sikh genocide; and

Whereas, Recognizing the state-sponsored violence that targeted Sikhs across India in 1984 is an important and historic step towards justice, accountability, and reconciliation, which should be an example to other governments; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey:

1. The New Jersey Senate condemns the November 1984 anti-Sikh violence in India as genocide.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Secretary of the Senate to the President and Vice-President of the United States, the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, and every member of Congress elected from this State.

POM-131. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado urging the United States Congress to adopt comprehensive voting rights legislation to protect the integrity of American democracy and the sacred right to vote; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 22-1004

Whereas, Every January we honor the memory of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and his heroic efforts to advance voting rights and we aspire to follow in his footsteps; and

Whereas, No one did more to promote the right to vote for disenfranchised Americans than the civil rights leaders of the 1960s, including Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Congressman John Lewis, Fannie Lou Hamer, and Ella Baker; and

Whereas, Until the United States Congress passed the federal "Voting Rights Act of 1965", people of color in the United States were frequently subject to poll taxes, literacy tests, and fraud and intimidation, preventing them from exercising their right to cast a ballot; and

Whereas, The United States Senate is considering critical federal elections reform and long overdue updates to the federal "Voting Rights Act of 1965" to preserve voting rights for generations to come, in honor of the legacy of the late Congressman John Lewis; and

Whereas, Colorado's electoral system serves as an example to the rest of the nation, and in fact the world, of how to expand voter access while protecting electoral integrity through safeguards including risk-limiting audits and signature verification; and

Whereas, In the 2020 election, Colorado had the second highest voter turnout of any state in the nation, and Colorado's largest voting bloc—young people ages 18 to 34—turned out in record numbers; and

Whereas, Efforts to suppress the vote and disenfranchise Americans who historically have had the least access to the ballot have been on the rise across the country in recent years; and

Whereas, Last year, more than 440 bills with provisions that restrict voting access were introduced in 49 states, including here in Colorado, where legislation was introduced to restrict voters' access to Colorado's vote by mail system, a national model of excellence for election access, security, and integrity; and

Whereas, Last year, 19 states passed 34 laws restricting access to voting, including Georgia's Senate Bill 202 and Texas' Senate Bill No. 1, both of which made it more difficult for voters to exercise their fundamental right to vote enshrined in the United States Constitution and the federal "Voting Rights Act of 1965"; and

Whereas, Falsehoods and conspiracies regarding the integrity of the 2020 election have run rampant in our media and public discourse; and

Whereas, The months-long, coordinated attempt to interfere with the democratic process following the November 2020 election and prevent the peaceful transfer of power by overturning the legitimate results of the presidential election, which culminated with the insurrection at the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021, serves as a violent reminder of the fragility of our democracy; now, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Seventy-third General Assembly of the State of Colorado:

That we, the members of the Colorado House of Representatives:

(1) Reassert the validity of the 2020 presidential election results as legitimate and verified;

(2) Offer Colorado's premier electoral system as a model for states across the country to adopt in order to increase voter participation while ensuring electoral integrity; and

(3) Call on the United States Congress, and specifically members of the United States Senate, to pass comprehensive voting rights legislation to protect the fundamental right to vote, which has been the cornerstone of our democracy since the founding of our republic.

Be It Further Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, the Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, the Minority Leader of the United States Senate, and all members of the Colorado Congressional delegation.

POM-132. A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, California, urging the United States Senate to ratify the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REED for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Musetta Tia Johnson, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces for a term of fifteen years to expire on the date prescribed by law.

*Marvin L. Adams, of Texas, to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, National Nuclear Security Administration.

*Erik Kristopher Raven, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

*William A. LaPlante, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 3991. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a demonstration program to test providing preferential treatment under the Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP programs for certain drugs and biologicals manufactured in the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3992. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for certain expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 3993. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow penalty-free withdrawals from retirement plans for domestic abuse victims; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. TUBERVILLE):

S. 3994. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to repay the estates of deceased beneficiaries for certain benefits paid by the Secretary and misused by fiduciaries of such beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 3995. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to provide for permanent duty-free treatment on imports of basketballs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 3996. A bill to provide for a method by which the economic costs of significant regulatory actions may be offset by the repeal of other regulatory actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 3997. A bill to amend the Land Between the Lakes Protection Act of 1998 to clarify the administration of the Land Between the Lakes National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 3998. A bill to clarify the inability of the President to declare national emergencies under the National Emergencies Act, major disasters or emergencies under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, and public health emergencies

under the Public Health Service Act on the premise of climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 3999. A bill to prohibit Amnesty International and its employees from receiving financial assistance from the United States Government; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 4000. A bill to require the establishment of cybersecurity information sharing agreements between the Department of Homeland Security and Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 4001. A bill to require the Secretary of State to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to suspend participation of the Russian Federation in certain international organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 4002. A bill to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to require the collection of small business loan data related to LGBTQ-owned businesses; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. COONS, Mrs. CAPITO, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 4003. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for training on alternatives to use of force, de-escalation, and mental and behavioral health and suicidal crises; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. LUMMIS, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 4004. A bill to alter requirements associated with small business loan data collection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HAGERTY (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 4005. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to provide increased protection for horses participating in shows, exhibitions, sales, and auctions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. KING, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 4006. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to list certain individuals who are awarded the Purple Heart on the internet website of the Department of Defense that lists individuals who have been awarded certain military awards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 4007. A bill to require the Attorney General to propose a program for making treatment for post-traumatic stress disorder and acute stress disorder available to public safety officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 4008. A bill to provide COVID relief for restaurants, gyms, minor league sports

teams, border businesses, live venue service providers, exclave businesses, and providers of transportation services; read the first time.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 344

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 344, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for concurrent receipt of veterans' disability compensation and retirement pay for disability retirees with fewer than 20 years of service and a combat-related disability, and for other purposes.

S. 377

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 377, a bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors.

S. 382

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 382, a bill to establish the Office of the Ombudsperson for Immigrant Children in Government Custody, and for other purposes.

S. 868

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 868, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title and waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals with Huntington's disease.

S. 1093

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1093, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish in the Department the Veterans Economic Opportunity and Transition Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 1136

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1136, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes.

S. 1467

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1467, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a series of clinical trials on the effects of cannabis on certain health outcomes of veterans with chronic pain and post-traumatic stress disorder, and for other purposes.

S. 1752

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1752, a bill to establish

the National Center for Advancement of Aviation.

S. 1858

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1858, a bill to prohibit and prevent seclusion, mechanical restraint, chemical restraint, and dangerous restraints that restrict breathing, and to prevent and reduce the use of physical restraint in schools, and for other purposes.

S. 2298

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2298, a bill to amend section 1977 of the Revised Statutes to protect equal rights under law.

S. 2386

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2386, a bill to amend the VA MISSION Act of 2018, to expand the peer specialist support program of the Department of Veterans Affairs to all medical centers of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 2607

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2607, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the former hostages of the Iran Hostage Crisis of 1979–1981, highlighting their resilience throughout the unprecedented ordeal that they lived through and the national unity it produced, marking 4 decades since their 444 days in captivity, and recognizing their sacrifice to the United States.

S. 2676

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2676, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of physical therapists in the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2971

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2971, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to revise the Standard Occupational Classification System to accurately count the number of emergency medical services practitioners in the United States.

S. 3279

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3279, a bill to extend duty-free treatment provided with respect to imports from Haiti under the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act.

S. 3331

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Montana

(Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3331, a bill to amend the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 to improve the semiconductor incentive program of the Department of Commerce.

S. 3505

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3505, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain Nurse Corps payments from gross income.

S. 3653

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3653, a bill to direct the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to require the disclosure of violations of Federal law with respect to human trafficking or alien smuggling, and for other purposes.

S. 3663

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3663, a bill to protect the safety of children on the internet.

S. 3761

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3761, a bill to support the provision of treatment family care services, and for other purposes.

S. 3877

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3877, a bill to require the imposition of sanctions with respect to Chinese financial institutions that clear, verify, or settle transactions with Russian or Russian-controlled financial institutions.

S. 3909

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3909, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make employers of spouses of military personnel eligible for the work opportunity credit.

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3909, *supra*.

S. 3959

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3959, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide the Secretary of Health and Human Services with the authority to suspend the right to introduce certain persons or property into the United States in the interest of the public health.

S. 3975

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from North Caro-

lina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3975, a bill to reauthorize the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 446

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 446, a resolution commending the Government of Lithuania for its resolve in increasing ties with Taiwan and supporting its firm stance against coercion by the Chinese Communist Party.

S. RES. 538

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 538, a resolution expressing support for a second United States-Africa Leaders Summit as an important opportunity to strengthen ties between the United States and African partners and build on areas of mutual interest.

S. RES. 570

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 570, a resolution designating April 2022 as "National Native Plant Month".

S. RES. 572

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 572, a resolution honoring the accomplishments and legacy of Cesar Estrada Chavez.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 3997. A bill to amend the Land Between the Lakes Protection Act of 1998 to clarify the administration of the Land Between the Lakes National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3997

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Land Between the Lakes Recreation and Heritage Act" or the "LBL Recreation and Heritage Act".

SEC. 2. ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAND BETWEEN THE LAKES NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 502 of the Land Between the Lakes Protection Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 460111) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5)(B)—

(A) in clause (viii), by striking "and" after the semicolon at the end;

(B) in clause (ix), by striking the period at the end and inserting "and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(x) division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code (formerly known as the 'National Historic Preservation Act').";

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (11) through (15) as paragraphs (12) through (16), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (10) the following:

"(11) QUALIFIED RESIDENT OR RELATIVE.—The term 'qualified resident or relative' means—

"(A) a former resident of the area within the Recreation Area or the spouse of a former resident of that area; or

"(B) a widow, widower, or lineal descendant of an individual buried in a cemetery located in the Recreation Area.".

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 511(b) of the Land Between the Lakes Protection Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 460111-11(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

"(3) STATUS OF UNIT.—The Secretary shall administer the Recreation Area as a separate unit of the National Forest System.".

(c) ADVISORY BOARD.—Section 522 of the Land Between the Lakes Protection Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 460111-22) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "17" and inserting "13";

(B) by striking paragraphs (4) and (5);

(C) in paragraph (3), by adding "and" after the semicolon at the end; and

(D) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (4);

(2) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(2) NONCONSECUTIVE TERMS.—Members of the Advisory Board may serve multiple terms, but may not serve consecutive terms.".

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "may advise" and inserting "shall advise and partner with";

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking "and" after the semicolon at the end;

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) developing an annual work plan for recreation and environment education areas in the Recreation Area, including the heritage program, with the nonappropriated amounts in the Land Between the Lakes Management Fund;

"(4) developing an annual forest management and harvest plan for the Recreation Area; and

"(5) the balance and status of the Land Between the Lakes Management Fund."; and

(4) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "biannually" and inserting "twice each year";

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting "on a public website of the Department of Agriculture," before "and by"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(4) MINUTES.—The chairperson of the Advisory Board shall publish the minutes of each meeting of the Advisory Board on a public website of the Department of Agriculture.".

(d) FEES.—Section 523(a) of the Land Between the Lakes Protection Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 460111-23(a)) is amended by striking "may charge reasonable fees" and inserting "shall charge reasonable fees, as determined by the Advisory Board.".

(e) DISPOSITION OF RECEIPTS.—Section 524 of the Land Between the Lakes Protection Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 460111-24) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

"(b) USE.—Amounts in the Land Between the Lakes Management Fund—

“(1) shall be available to the Secretary until expended, without further appropriation, to perform new work or deferred maintenance in the Recreation Area; and

“(2) shall not be available for the payment of salaries or other expenses.”.

(f) COOPERATIVE AUTHORITIES AND GIFTS.—Section 526 of the Land Between the Lakes Protection Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 460111–26) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING.—The Secretary is encouraged, for purposes of carrying out this Act—

“(1) to enter into memoranda of understanding with State or local government entities, including law enforcement, as appropriate, to clarify jurisdictional matters, such as road management, policing, and other functions that are typically performed by the entity on non-Federal land; and

“(2) to make available on a public website of the Department of Agriculture any memorandum of understanding entered into under paragraph (1).”.

(g) CEMETERIES.—Section 528 of the Land Between the Lakes Protection Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 460111–28) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) LAND FOR PLOTS FOR QUALIFIED RESIDENTS OR RELATIVES.—

“(1) REQUESTS.—The Secretary, on request from a qualified resident or relative or a cemetery association, shall grant additional land for the expansion of existing cemeteries within the Recreation Area to allow for the burial of qualified residents or relatives.

“(2) EXPENSES.—Any expenses required to move border fences or markers due to an expansion under paragraph (1) shall be the responsibility of the person making the request under that paragraph.”.

(h) RESOURCE MANAGEMENT.—Section 529 of the Land Between the Lakes Protection Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 460111–29) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) HISTORICAL RESOURCES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall identify and manage the historical resources of the Recreation Area—

“(A) in accordance with the requirements of division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code (formerly known as the ‘National Historic Preservation Act’); and

“(B) in coordination with qualified residents or relatives.

“(2) CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) give consideration to requests by qualified residents or relatives to use and maintain traditional sites, buildings, cemeteries, and other areas of cultural importance in the Recreation Area; and

“(B) work cooperatively with qualified residents or relatives in the management of the historical resources of the Recreation Area.”.

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 551 of the Land Between the Lakes Protection Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 460111–61) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) MINIMUM EXPENDITURE.—Subject to the availability of appropriations under subsection (a), the Secretary shall make available not less than \$8,000,000 each fiscal year for the purposes of administering the Recreation Area (not including salaries and expenses).”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I have eight requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 5, 2022, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 5, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 5, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 5, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 5, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 5, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY

The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 5, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES, WATER, AND WILDLIFE

The Subcommittee on Fisheries, Water, and Wildlife of the Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 5, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my very able legislative fellow Alexander Nabavi-Noori be granted floor privileges until the end of August 2022.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 4008

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4008) to provide COVID relief for restaurants, gyms, minor league sports teams, border businesses, live venue service providers, exclave businesses, and providers of transportation services.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

PRAY SAFE ACT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 277, S. 2123.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2123) to establish the Federal Clearinghouse on Safety and Security Best Practices for Faith-Based Organizations and Houses of Worship, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italics.)

S. 2123

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Pray Safe Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “Clearinghouse” means the Federal Clearinghouse on Safety Best Practices for Faith-Based Organizations and Houses of Worship established under section 2220A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 3 of this Act;

(2) the term “Department” means the Department of Homeland Security;

(3) the terms “faith-based organization” and “house of worship” have the meanings given such terms under section 2220A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 3 of this Act; and

(4) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SEC. 3. FEDERAL CLEARINGHOUSE ON SAFETY AND SECURITY BEST PRACTICES FOR FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS AND HOUSES OF WORSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title XXII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 651 et seq.), as amended by section 9, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 2220A. FEDERAL CLEARINGHOUSE ON SAFETY AND SECURITY BEST PRACTICES FOR FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS AND HOUSES OF WORSHIP.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘Clearinghouse’ means the Clearinghouse on Safety and Security Best Practices for Faith-Based Organizations and Houses of Worship established under subsection (b)(1);

“(2) the term ‘faith-based organization’ means a group, center, or nongovernmental

organization with a religious, ideological, or spiritual motivation, character, affiliation, or purpose;

“(3) the term ‘house of worship’ means a place or building, including synagogues, mosques, temples, and churches, in which congregants practice their religious or spiritual beliefs; and

“(4) the term ‘safety and security’, for the purpose of the Clearinghouse, means prevention of, protection against, or recovery from threats, including manmade disasters, natural disasters, or violent attacks.

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of the Pray Safe Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Executive Director of the White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships, and the head of any other agency that the Secretary determines appropriate, shall establish a Federal Clearinghouse on Safety and Security Best Practices for Faith-Based Organizations and Houses of Worship within the Department.

“(2) PURPOSE.—The Clearinghouse shall be the primary resource of the Federal Government—

“(A) to educate and publish online best practices and recommendations for safety and security for faith-based organizations and houses of worship; and

“(B) to provide information relating to Federal grant programs available to faith-based organizations and houses of worship.

“(3) PERSONNEL.—

“(A) ASSIGNMENTS.—The Clearinghouse shall be assigned such personnel and resources as the Secretary considers appropriate to carry out this section.

“(B) DETAILEES.—The Secretary may coordinate detailees as required for the Clearinghouse.

“(C) DESIGNATED POINT OF CONTACT.—There shall be not less than 1 employee assigned or detailed to the Clearinghouse who shall be the designated point of contact to provide information and assistance to faith-based organizations and houses of worship, including assistance relating to the grant program established under section 5 of the Pray Safe Act. The contact information of the designated point of contact shall be made available on the website of the Clearinghouse.

“(D) QUALIFICATION.—To the maximum extent possible, any personnel assigned or detailed to the Clearinghouse under this paragraph should be familiar with faith-based organizations and houses of worship and with physical and online security measures to identify and prevent safety and security risks.

“(c) CLEARINGHOUSE CONTENTS.—

“(1) EVIDENCE-BASED TIERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Executive Director of the White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships, and the head of any other agency that the Secretary determines appropriate, shall develop tiers for determining evidence-based practices that demonstrate a significant effect on improving safety or security, or both, for faith-based organizations and houses of worship.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The tiers required to be developed under subparagraph (A) shall—

“(i) prioritize—

“(I) strong evidence from not less than 1 well-designed and well-implemented experimental study; and

“(II) moderate evidence from not less than 1 well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study; and

“(ii) consider promising evidence that demonstrates a rationale based on high-quality research findings or positive evaluations that such activity, strategy, or intervention

is likely to improve security and promote safety for faith-based organizations and houses of worship.

“(2) CRITERIA FOR BEST PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—The best practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse shall, at a minimum—

“(A) identify areas of concern for faith-based organizations and houses of worship, including event planning recommendations, checklists, facility hardening, tabletop exercise resources, and other resilience measures;

“(B) involve comprehensive safety measures, including threat prevention, preparedness, protection, mitigation, incident response, and recovery to improve the safety posture of faith-based organizations and houses of worship upon implementation;

“(C) involve comprehensive safety measures, including preparedness, protection, mitigation, incident response, and recovery to improve the resiliency of faith-based organizations and houses of worship from man-made and natural disasters;

“(D) include any evidence or research rationale supporting the determination of the Clearinghouse that the best practices or recommendations under subparagraph (B) have been shown to have a significant effect on improving the safety and security of individuals in faith-based organizations and houses of worship, including—

“(i) findings and data from previous Federal, State, local, Tribal, territorial, private sector, and nongovernmental organization research centers relating to safety, security, and targeted violence at faith-based organizations and houses of worship; and

“(ii) other supportive evidence or findings relied upon by the Clearinghouse in determining best practices and recommendations to improve the safety and security posture of a faith-based organization or house of worship upon implementation; and

“(E) include an overview of the available resources the Clearinghouse can provide for faith-based organizations and houses of worship.

“(3) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—The Clearinghouse shall maintain and make available a comprehensive index of all Federal grant programs for which faith-based organizations and houses of worship are eligible, which shall include the performance metrics for each grant management that the recipient will be required to provide.

“(4) PAST RECOMMENDATIONS.—To the greatest extent practicable, the Clearinghouse shall identify and present, as appropriate, best practices and recommendations issued by Federal, State, local, Tribal, territorial, private sector, and nongovernmental organizations relevant to the safety and security of faith-based organizations and houses of worship.

“(d) ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—The Secretary may produce and publish materials on the Clearinghouse to assist and train faith-based organizations, houses of worship, and law enforcement agencies on the implementation of the best practices and recommendations.

“(e) CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) collect for the purpose of continuous improvement of the Clearinghouse—

“(i) Clearinghouse data analytics;

“(ii) user feedback on the implementation of resources, best practices, and recommendations identified by the Clearinghouse; and

“(iii) any evaluations conducted on implementation of the best practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse; and

“(B) in coordination with the Faith-Based Security Advisory Council of the Department, the Department of Justice, the Execu-

tive Director of the White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships, and any other agency that the Secretary determines appropriate—

“(i) assess and identify Clearinghouse best practices and recommendations for which there are no resources available through Federal Government programs for implementation;

“(ii) provide feedback on the implementation of best practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse; and

“(iii) propose additional recommendations for best practices for inclusion in the Clearinghouse; and

“(C) not less frequently than annually, examine and update the Clearinghouse in accordance with—

“(i) the information collected under subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) the recommendations proposed under subparagraph (B)(iii).

“(2) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress, on an annual basis, a report on the updates made to the Clearinghouse during the preceding 1-year period under paragraph (1)(C), which shall include a description of any changes made to the Clearinghouse.”

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296; 116 Stat. 2135), as amended by section 9 of this Act, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2220 the following:

“Sec. 2220A. Federal Clearinghouse on Safety Best Practices for Faith-Based Organizations and Houses of Worship.”

SEC. 4. NOTIFICATION OF CLEARINGHOUSE.

The Secretary shall provide written notification of the establishment of the Clearinghouse, with an overview of the resources required as described in section 2220A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 3 of this Act, and section 5 of this Act, to—

(1) every State homeland security advisor;

(2) every State department of homeland security;

(3) other Federal agencies with grant programs or initiatives that aid in the safety and security of faith-based organizations and houses of worship, as determined appropriate by the Secretary;

(4) every Federal Bureau of Investigation Joint Terrorism Task Force;

(5) every Homeland Security Fusion Center;

(6) every State or territorial Governor or other chief executive;

(7) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(8) the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5. GRANT PROGRAM OVERVIEW.

(a) DHS GRANTS AND RESOURCES.—The Secretary shall include a grants program overview on the website of the Clearinghouse that shall—

(1) be the primary location for all information regarding Department grant programs that are open to faith-based organizations and houses of worship;

(2) directly link to each grant application and any applicable user guides;

(3) identify all safety and security homeland security assistance programs managed by the Department that may be used to implement best practices and recommendation of the Clearinghouse;

(4) annually, and concurrent with the application period for any grant identified

under paragraph (1), provide information related to the required elements of grant applications to aid smaller faith-based organizations and houses of worship in earning access to Federal grants; and

(5) provide frequently asked questions and answers for the implementation of best practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse and best practices for applying for a grant identified under paragraph (1).

(b) **OTHER FEDERAL GRANTS AND RESOURCES.**—Each Federal agency notified under section 4(3) shall provide necessary information on any Federal grant programs or resources of the Federal agency that are available for faith-based organizations and houses of worship to the Secretary or the appropriate point of contact for the Clearinghouse.

(c) **STATE GRANTS AND RESOURCES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any State notified under paragraph (1), (2), or (6) of section 4 may provide necessary information on any grant programs or resources of the State available for faith-based organizations and houses of worship to the Secretary or the appropriate point of contact for the Clearinghouse.

(2) **IDENTIFICATION OF RESOURCES.**—The Clearinghouse shall, to the extent practicable, identify, for each State—

(A) each agency responsible for safety for faith-based organizations and houses of worship in the State, or any State that does not have such an agency designated;

(B) any grant program that may be used for the purposes of implementing best practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse; and

(C) any resources or programs, including community prevention or intervention efforts, that may be used to assist in targeted violence and terrorism prevention.

SEC. 6. OTHER RESOURCES.

The Secretary shall, on the website of the Clearinghouse, include a separate section for other resources that shall provide a centralized list of all available points of contact to seek assistance in grant applications and in carrying out the best practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse, including—

(1) a list of contact information to reach Department personnel to assist with grant-related questions;

(2) the applicable Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency contact information to connect houses of worship with Protective Security Advisors;

(3) contact information for all Department Fusion Centers, listed by State;

(4) information on the If you See Something Say Something Campaign of the Department; and

(5) any other appropriate contacts.

SEC. 7. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to create, satisfy, or waive any requirement under Federal civil rights laws, including—

(1) title II of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12131 et seq.); or

(2) title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.).

SEC. 8. EXEMPTION.

Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the “Paperwork Reduction Act”) shall not apply to any rulemaking or information collection required under this Act or under section 2220A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 3 of this Act.

SEC. 9. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) **REDESIGNATIONS.**—Subtitle A of title XXII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 651 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 2217 (6 U.S.C. 665f) as section 2220;

(2) by redesignating section 2216 (6 U.S.C. 665e) as section 2219;

(3) by redesignating the fourth section 2215 (relating to Sector Risk Management Agencies) (6 U.S.C. 665d) as section 2218;

(4) by redesignating the third section 2215 (relating to the Cybersecurity State Coordinator) (6 U.S.C. 665c) as section 2217; and

(5) by redesignating the second section 2215 (relating to the Joint Cyber Planning Office) (6 U.S.C. 665b) as section 2216.

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 2202(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 652(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (11), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in the first paragraph (12)—

(A) by striking “section 2215” and inserting “section 2217”; and

(B) by striking “and” at the end; and

(3) by redesignating the second and third paragraphs (12) as paragraphs (13) and (14), respectively.

(c) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–296; 116 Stat. 2135) is amended by striking the item relating to section 2214 and all that follows through the item relating to section 2217 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 2214. National Asset Database.

“Sec. 2215. Duties and authorities relating to .gov internet domain.

“Sec. 2216. Joint Cyber Planning Office.

“Sec. 2217. Cybersecurity State Coordinator.

“Sec. 2218. Sector Risk Management Agencies.

“Sec. 2219. Cybersecurity Advisory Committee.

“Sec. 2220. Cybersecurity education and training programs.”.

(d) **ADDITIONAL TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—

(1) **AMENDMENT.**—Section 904(b)(1) of the DOTGOV Act of 2020 (title IX of division U of Public Law 116–260) is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “Homeland Security Act” and inserting “Homeland Security Act of 2002”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as if enacted as part of the DOTGOV Act of 2020 (title IX of division U of Public Law 116–260).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendments be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendments were agreed to.

The bill (S. 2123), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2123

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Pray Safe Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “Clearinghouse” means the Federal Clearinghouse on Safety Best Practices for Faith-Based Organizations and Houses of Worship established under section 2220A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 3 of this Act;

(2) the term “Department” means the Department of Homeland Security;

(3) the terms “faith-based organization” and “house of worship” have the meanings given such terms under section 2220A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 3 of this Act; and

(4) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SEC. 3. FEDERAL CLEARINGHOUSE ON SAFETY AND SECURITY BEST PRACTICES FOR FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS AND HOUSES OF WORSHIP.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle A of title XXII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 651 et seq.), as amended by section 9, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 2220A. FEDERAL CLEARINGHOUSE ON SAFETY AND SECURITY BEST PRACTICES FOR FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS AND HOUSES OF WORSHIP.

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘Clearinghouse’ means the Clearinghouse on Safety and Security Best Practices for Faith-Based Organizations and Houses of Worship established under subsection (b)(1);

“(2) the term ‘faith-based organization’ means a group, center, or nongovernmental organization with a religious, ideological, or spiritual motivation, character, affiliation, or purpose;

“(3) the term ‘house of worship’ means a place or building, including synagogues, mosques, temples, and churches, in which congregants practice their religious or spiritual beliefs; and

“(4) the term ‘safety and security’, for the purpose of the Clearinghouse, means prevention of, protection against, or recovery from threats, including manmade disasters, natural disasters, or violent attacks.

“(b) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of the Pray Safe Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Executive Director of the White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships, and the head of any other agency that the Secretary determines appropriate, shall establish a Federal Clearinghouse on Safety and Security Best Practices for Faith-Based Organizations and Houses of Worship within the Department.

“(2) **PURPOSE.**—The Clearinghouse shall be the primary resource of the Federal Government—

“(A) to educate and publish online best practices and recommendations for safety and security for faith-based organizations and houses of worship; and

“(B) to provide information relating to Federal grant programs available to faith-based organizations and houses of worship.

“(3) **PERSONNEL.**—

“(A) **ASSIGNMENTS.**—The Clearinghouse shall be assigned such personnel and resources as the Secretary considers appropriate to carry out this section.

“(B) **DETAILLEES.**—The Secretary may coordinate detailees as required for the Clearinghouse.

“(C) **DESIGNATED POINT OF CONTACT.**—There shall be not less than 1 employee assigned or detailed to the Clearinghouse who shall be the designated point of contact to provide information and assistance to faith-based organizations and houses of worship, including assistance relating to the grant program established under section 5 of the Pray Safe Act. The contact information of the designated point of contact shall be made available on the website of the Clearinghouse.

“(D) **QUALIFICATION.**—To the maximum extent possible, any personnel assigned or detailed to the Clearinghouse under this paragraph should be familiar with faith-based organizations and houses of worship and with

physical and online security measures to identify and prevent safety and security risks.

“(C) CLEARINGHOUSE CONTENTS.—

“(1) EVIDENCE-BASED TIERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Executive Director of the White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships, and the head of any other agency that the Secretary determines appropriate, shall develop tiers for determining evidence-based practices that demonstrate a significant effect on improving safety or security, or both, for faith-based organizations and houses of worship.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The tiers required to be developed under subparagraph (A) shall—

“(i) prioritize—

“(I) strong evidence from not less than 1 well-designed and well-implemented experimental study; and

“(II) moderate evidence from not less than 1 well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study; and

“(ii) consider promising evidence that demonstrates a rationale based on high-quality research findings or positive evaluations that such activity, strategy, or intervention is likely to improve security and promote safety for faith-based organizations and houses of worship.

“(2) CRITERIA FOR BEST PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—The best practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse shall, at a minimum—

“(A) identify areas of concern for faith-based organizations and houses of worship, including event planning recommendations, checklists, facility hardening, tabletop exercise resources, and other resilience measures;

“(B) involve comprehensive safety measures, including threat prevention, preparedness, protection, mitigation, incident response, and recovery to improve the safety posture of faith-based organizations and houses of worship upon implementation;

“(C) involve comprehensive safety measures, including preparedness, protection, mitigation, incident response, and recovery to improve the resiliency of faith-based organizations and houses of worship from man-made and natural disasters;

“(D) include any evidence or research rationale supporting the determination of the Clearinghouse that the best practices or recommendations under subparagraph (B) have been shown to have a significant effect on improving the safety and security of individuals in faith-based organizations and houses of worship, including—

“(i) findings and data from previous Federal, State, local, Tribal, territorial, private sector, and nongovernmental organization research centers relating to safety, security, and targeted violence at faith-based organizations and houses of worship; and

“(ii) other supportive evidence or findings relied upon by the Clearinghouse in determining best practices and recommendations to improve the safety and security posture of a faith-based organization or house of worship upon implementation; and

“(E) include an overview of the available resources the Clearinghouse can provide for faith-based organizations and houses of worship.

“(3) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—The Clearinghouse shall maintain and make available a comprehensive index of all Federal grant programs for which faith-based organizations and houses of worship are eligible, which shall include the performance metrics for each grant management that the recipient will be required to provide.

“(4) PAST RECOMMENDATIONS.—To the greatest extent practicable, the Clearing-

house shall identify and present, as appropriate, best practices and recommendations issued by Federal, State, local, Tribal, territorial, private sector, and nongovernmental organizations relevant to the safety and security of faith-based organizations and houses of worship.

“(d) ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—The Secretary may produce and publish materials on the Clearinghouse to assist and train faith-based organizations, houses of worship, and law enforcement agencies on the implementation of the best practices and recommendations.

“(e) CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) collect for the purpose of continuous improvement of the Clearinghouse—

“(i) Clearinghouse data analytics;

“(ii) user feedback on the implementation of resources, best practices, and recommendations identified by the Clearinghouse; and

“(iii) any evaluations conducted on implementation of the best practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse; and

“(B) in coordination with the Faith-Based Security Advisory Council of the Department, the Department of Justice, the Executive Director of the White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships, and any other agency that the Secretary determines appropriate—

“(i) assess and identify Clearinghouse best practices and recommendations for which there are no resources available through Federal Government programs for implementation;

“(ii) provide feedback on the implementation of best practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse; and

“(iii) propose additional recommendations for best practices for inclusion in the Clearinghouse; and

“(C) not less frequently than annually, examine and update the Clearinghouse in accordance with—

“(i) the information collected under subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) the recommendations proposed under subparagraph (B)(iii).

“(2) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress, on an annual basis, a report on the updates made to the Clearinghouse during the preceding 1-year period under paragraph (1)(C), which shall include a description of any changes made to the Clearinghouse.”

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296; 116 Stat. 2135), as amended by section 9 of this Act, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2220 the following:

“Sec. 2220A. Federal Clearinghouse on Safety Best Practices for Faith-Based Organizations and Houses of Worship.”

SEC. 4. NOTIFICATION OF CLEARINGHOUSE.

The Secretary shall provide written notification of the establishment of the Clearinghouse, with an overview of the resources required as described in section 2220A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 3 of this Act, and section 5 of this Act, to—

(1) every State homeland security advisor;

(2) every State department of homeland security;

(3) other Federal agencies with grant programs or initiatives that aid in the safety and security of faith-based organizations and houses of worship, as determined appropriate by the Secretary;

(4) every Federal Bureau of Investigation Joint Terrorism Task Force;

(5) every Homeland Security Fusion Center;

(6) every State or territorial Governor or other chief executive;

(7) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(8) the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5. GRANT PROGRAM OVERVIEW.

(a) DHS GRANTS AND RESOURCES.—The Secretary shall include a grants program overview on the website of the Clearinghouse that shall—

(1) be the primary location for all information regarding Department grant programs that are open to faith-based organizations and houses of worship;

(2) directly link to each grant application and any applicable user guides;

(3) identify all safety and security homeland security assistance programs managed by the Department that may be used to implement best practices and recommendation of the Clearinghouse;

(4) annually, and concurrent with the application period for any grant identified under paragraph (1), provide information related to the required elements of grant applications to aid smaller faith based organizations and houses of worship in earning access to Federal grants; and

(5) provide frequently asked questions and answers for the implementation of best practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse and best practices for applying for a grant identified under paragraph (1).

(b) OTHER FEDERAL GRANTS AND RESOURCES.—Each Federal agency notified under section 4(3) shall provide necessary information on any Federal grant programs or resources of the Federal agency that are available for faith-based organizations and houses of worship to the Secretary or the appropriate point of contact for the Clearinghouse.

(c) STATE GRANTS AND RESOURCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any State notified under paragraph (1), (2), or (6) of section 4 may provide necessary information on any grant programs or resources of the State available for faith-based organizations and houses of worship to the Secretary or the appropriate point of contact for the Clearinghouse.

(2) IDENTIFICATION OF RESOURCES.—The Clearinghouse shall, to the extent practicable, identify, for each State—

(A) each agency responsible for safety for faith-based organizations and houses of worship in the State, or any State that does not have such an agency designated;

(B) any grant program that may be used for the purposes of implementing best practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse; and

(C) any resources or programs, including community prevention or intervention efforts, that may be used to assist in targeted violence and terrorism prevention.

SEC. 6. OTHER RESOURCES.

The Secretary shall, on the website of the Clearinghouse, include a separate section for other resources that shall provide a centralized list of all available points of contact to seek assistance in grant applications and in carrying out the best practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse, including—

(1) a list of contact information to reach Department personnel to assist with grant-related questions;

(2) the applicable Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency contact information to connect houses of worship with Protective Security Advisors;

(3) contact information for all Department Fusion Centers, listed by State;

(4) information on the If you See Something Say Something Campaign of the Department; and

(5) any other appropriate contacts.

SEC. 7. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to create, satisfy, or waive any requirement under Federal civil rights laws, including—

(1) title II of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12131 et seq.); or

(2) title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.).

SEC. 8. EXEMPTION.

Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the “Paperwork Reduction Act”) shall not apply to any rulemaking or information collection required under this Act or under section 2220A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 3 of this Act.

SEC. 9. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) REDESIGNATIONS.—Subtitle A of title XXII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 651 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 2217 (6 U.S.C. 665f) as section 2220;

(2) by redesignating section 2216 (6 U.S.C. 665e) as section 2219;

(3) by redesignating the fourth section 2215 (relating to Sector Risk Management Agencies) (6 U.S.C. 665d) as section 2218;

(4) by redesignating the third section 2215 (relating to the Cybersecurity State Coordinator) (6 U.S.C. 665c) as section 2217; and

(5) by redesignating the second section 2215 (relating to the Joint Cyber Planning Office) (6 U.S.C. 665b) as section 2216.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2202(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 652(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (11), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in the first paragraph (12)—

(A) by striking “section 2215” and inserting “section 2217”; and

(B) by striking “and” at the end; and

(3) by redesignating the second and third paragraphs (12) as paragraphs (13) and (14), respectively.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296; 116 Stat. 2135) is amended by striking the item relating to section 2214 and all that follows through the item relating to section 2217 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 2214. National Asset Database.

“Sec. 2215. Duties and authorities relating to .gov internet domain.

“Sec. 2216. Joint Cyber Planning Office.

“Sec. 2217. Cybersecurity State Coordinator.

“Sec. 2218. Sector Risk Management Agencies.

“Sec. 2219. Cybersecurity Advisory Committee.

“Sec. 2220. Cybersecurity education and training programs.”.

(d) ADDITIONAL TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Section 904(b)(1) of the DOTGOV Act of 2020 (title IX of division U of Public Law 116-260) is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “Homeland Security Act” and inserting “Homeland Security Act of 2002”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as if enacted as part of the DOTGOV Act of 2020 (title IX of division U of Public Law 116-260).

SHADOW WOLVES ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 5681, which was received by the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5681) to authorize the reclassification of the tactical enforcement officers (commonly known as the “Shadow Wolves”) in the Homeland Security Investigations tactical patrol unit operating on the lands of the Tohono O’odham Nation as special agents, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 5681) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 2022

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, April 6, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the nomination of Ketanji Brown Jackson to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court; that at 11:45 a.m., the Senate execute the previous order with respect to the O’Brien

nomination and vote on the confirmation of the nomination; finally, if any nominations are confirmed during Wednesday’s session of the Senate, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:22 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, April 6, 2022, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

VINAY VIJAY SINGH, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE IRVING DENNIS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ROBERT F. GODEC, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF THAILAND.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

KALPANA KOTAGAL, OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2027, VICE JANET DHILLON, TERM EXPIRING.

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination pursuant to S. Res. 27, and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

JULIA RUTH GORDON, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 5, 2022:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

KATHERINE VIDAL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DATA MAPPING TO SAVE MOMS' LIVES ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 2022

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, as many of you know, the United States is one of the only developed nations in the world where the maternal mortality rate continues to rise every year. The rate of mortality is especially higher in minority populations and rural communities—those who most often sit on the wrong side of the digital divide. This women's health crisis has had a particularly disparate impact on the African American community. African American women are three times more likely to die during pregnancy and childbirth than their counterparts. Physicians and scientists continue to study the cause of these high numbers, citing lack of access to resources as one of many reasons the maternal mortality rate continues to rise. These resources include, but are not limited, to broadband access.

My bill, the Data Mapping to Save Moms' Lives Act, focuses on overlaying broadband connectivity data held by the FCC with health information held by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Armed with this information, policymakers will be able to target connectivity resources where telehealth may be able to assist medical professionals remotely monitor the health of pregnant women. We must act to address this crisis and my bill will give us the needed information to target our interventions.

I urge my colleagues to help protect our Nation's mothers and vote yes on H.R. 1218, the Data Mapping to Save Moms' Lives Act.

GIRLS OF STEEL

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2022

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the Girls of Steel robotics team for qualifying for the eleventh time to attend the FIRST World Championship competition by winning the Regional Engineering Inspiration award at the Greater Pittsburgh Regional, held at California University of Pennsylvania in California, Pennsylvania, between March 17th and 19th, 2022.

I also want to commend the Girls of Steel for winning the Regional Chairman's Award at the Buckeye Regional held at Cleveland State University in Cleveland, Ohio, between March 24 and 26, 2022. The Regional Chairman's Award is the most prestigious award at FIRST. It honors the team that best represents a model for other teams to emulate and best embodies the purpose and goals of FIRST.

The students are proud that their awards qualify them to attend the 2022 FIRST World Championship in Houston, Texas. I think that the remarkable accomplishment of continuously making it to the Championship speaks volumes about the dedication these young women have in pursuing "STEM"—Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math—careers, their ability to sustain their team, and the thousands of hours they have spent collectively doing outreach in the community. The Girls of Steel are often referred to as the hometown favorite robotics group and continue to be featured in videos, print media, and blog posts.

FIRST, which stands for "For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology," is an organization dedicated to engaging our students in STEM fields. Hundreds of thousands of students gain practical, team-based engineering experiences through FIRST every year.

As a founder and co-chair of the Congressional Robotics Caucus, I believe competitions like these are incredible tools for helping our young people to explore potential careers in STEM. I've witnessed firsthand the incredible economic growth and development that these fields can bring to my home district, and I strongly believe that these fields are crucial to our nation's future prosperity. For encouraging young people in these pursuits, I want to commend organizations like FIRST for their important work. The FIRST Robotics Competition allows students to apply creativity and critical thinking in the demanding and competitive field of robotics, all while instilling a strong sense of pride in participants.

Fifty-three young women from 8th through 12th grade associated with schools located in and around the Pittsburgh area represent this year's Girls of Steel program, and in recognition of their hard work, intelligence, and teamwork, I would like to mention each of these inspiring young people by name. They are Ciara Anderson, Ariella Avigad, Somdatta Basu, Justine Bennett, Aashi Bhatt, Megan Cassady, Elise Chu, Diya Cowlagi, Nina Cranor, Elizabeth Crookston, Maggie Davis, Maeve Dever, Mikaela Dassanaik-Perera, Natalie Ficca, Alexandra George, Susanna Getty, Anuva Ghosalkar, Teodora Gildengers, Grace Goslin, Samhita Gudapati, Katherine Hu, Rayna Huang, Amanda Hulver, Amy Jin, Janise Kim, Jessie Lee, Harshitha Lingam, Kameron Locy, Elizabeth Maier, Mia Maurizio, Lauren Michaels, Ava Miller, Sreyashi Mondal, Aria Narasimhan, Madeleine Ng, Swathi Padmanabhan, Dustana Roberts, Gray Scherer, Lucia Samaras, Mahika Shetty, Sophia Shetty, Rishika Somireddy, Aditi Srivastava, Tara Staresinic, Kelly Tai, Aditri Thakur, Justina Wang, Ashley Wei, Gloria Wen, Hannah Yang, Mary Zagrocki, Kexin Zhao, and Audrey Zheng.

Additionally, I want to convey my sincere appreciation to the faculty and staff of Carnegie Mellon University's Field Robotics Center, who have mentored the Girls of Steel since 2010. Because of their efforts, more young women experience real-world techno-

logical challenges and learn from some of the nation's best at solving these problems. These experiences will certainly benefit these young women in the future.

The Girls of Steel will compete in the FIRST Championship in Houston, Texas, at the end of April—one of the largest competitions of its kind. It's essentially the Super Bowl of Smarts. They will compete against top teams from all over the world.

I congratulate the Girls of Steel and wish them all continued success in their academic and professional endeavors.

DR. ROBERT MCCRORY

HON. JAMES COMER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2022

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor Dr. Robert McCrory for his admirable commitment to revitalizing the legendary Tater Day Festival in Benton, Kentucky.

Today this annual tradition in Marshall County will commence, bringing the community together for a weekend of fun, entertainment, and competition.

Originally started in 1843 when farmers came to town to trade sweet potatoes, this event was unfortunately lagging by the 1960s. Dr. McCrory didn't like that—and nor did he accept it.

A longtime community leader and a charter member of the local Kiwanis Club, he took a lead role in returning this event to its prior legendary status.

As head of a committee formed to do just that—Dr. McCrory revitalized Tater Day in a major way. Now, this historic event features sizable crowds that descend on Benton every year for a parade, contests, and tasty potato treats.

Without Dr. McCrory's leadership, this proud local tradition would not be what it is today. Because of that, I express my sincere thanks to him as Marshall County and West Kentucky's representative in Washington.

TRIBUTE TO ANA J. KORDOVICH GALOVSKI

HON. JOSEPH D. MORELLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2022

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to Ana J. Kordovich Galovski, who passed away earlier this year following a battle with Alzheimer's disease.

Ana was born in Bukov, Macedonia and immigrated to the United States in 1951, where she was able to meet her father for the first time at the age of 12. She attended West High School here in Rochester and graduated as a member of the Class of 1957.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Ana was deeply involved in the local community—especially in the local Macedonian community. She was a founding member of St. Dimitria Macedonian Orthodox Church in Henrietta, NY and remained active in the church community throughout her life. She was often seen attending services and board meetings, singing in the choir, or calling bingo numbers. Ana went above and beyond to help those in the Macedonian community acclimate to living in the United States.

Ana loved to travel with friends and family, especially with her grandkids later in life. She was loved by all who knew her, and she will be deeply missed. My heart goes out to her entire family during this difficult time.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF MR.
WARREN WRIGHT BROOME

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2022

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and service of Mr. Warren Wright Broome, a committed, retired member of the United States Navy and a beloved husband, father, and brother. Warren Wright Broome, 100 years old, passed away on March 21, 2022, in Camden, Arkansas. He was born on January 12, 1922, in Kathwood, South Carolina, to James Manford and Ruby Brinson Broome.

Warren enlisted in the Navy in June 1942 and served until his retirement in August 1972. During his thirty years of honorable service to our Nation, he fought in three Wars: World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War. After his retirement from the Navy, he worked for RCA Service Company in Washington, D.C. Mr. Broome loved history, was a wonderful storyteller, and an avid book collector who enjoyed spending time in his library. He was also particularly dedicated to his faith and was an active member of the United Methodist Men and of Fairview United Methodist Church in Camden. Mr. Broome led a rich life filled with laughter and will be missed by all who knew him.

I take this time today to celebrate the life and service of Mr. Warren Wright Broome. I thank him for his dedication to our fellow citizens and our beloved Fourth District of Arkansas.

HONORING MR. KEN DUBERSTEIN
FOR HIS LIFETIME OF ACHIEVEMENTS

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2022

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Ken Duberstein for his lifetime of achievements in both the private sector and public service.

Ken Duberstein was born in Brooklyn, New York and grew up loving everything the city had to offer. Duberstein's first political experience as a young boy was handing out leaflets for Republican presidential candidate Dwight

D. Eisenhower during the 1952 election. After graduating from high school, Mr. Duberstein attended Franklin & Marshall College in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. He went on to obtain a master's degree in political science at American University. Mr. Duberstein got his first taste of Capitol Hill with an internship in the office of Republican Senator Jacob Javits from New York. He then went on to work for the General Services Administration in the 1970s and later for the U.S. Department of Labor.

In 1981, Ken joined President Reagan's White House as the President's liaison to the House of Representatives. During this time, he helped Congress push through an extensive tax cut by successfully convincing conservative Democrats to break with their party. In 1987, Ken accompanied President Reagan to the Berlin Wall in 1987 and played a pivotal role in the subsequent summit between Reagan and Gorbachev. Duberstein became White House Chief of Staff in 1988. After his years of public service, Ken opened the tremendously successful boutique firm, The Duberstein Group, Inc.

Ken Duberstein remained steadfast in his patriotism, commitment to country, and served as a mentor to Presidents of the United States, White House Chiefs of Staff, Members of Congress, and countless senior elected and appointed officials. He was deeply respected by both sides of the aisle. On behalf of New York's 21st Congressional District, I am honored to recognize his remarkable leadership and life.

HONORING MAYOR SANDY LUCY

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2022

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a woman who has dedicated her life to public service and the people of Washington, Missouri. After being in public service for over thirty years and as the Mayor of Washington, Missouri for almost twelve years, Mayor Sandy Lucy is retiring.

Over the past thirty years Mayor Lucy has served her community in multiple roles. She was president of Downtown Washington Inc. and a member of the Washington Area Chamber of Commerce. Most recently she was the first woman to serve as Mayor of Washington, Missouri. As Mayor she served with professionalism, honor, and integrity. Through her leadership the city has achieved many successes and earned Washington the Great American Main Street Award. Mayor Lucy leaves a legacy that will be cherished by the community for years to come.

Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating Mayor Sandy Lucy on an exceptional career and a well-deserved retirement.

HONORING DOLORES H.
HICKAMBOTTOM

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2022

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, Dolores H. Hickambottom is a true legend in Altadena,

Pasadena and the Greater San Gabriel Valley. Widely admired and greatly respected in the community, she was at the forefront of many monumental issues for over five decades.

Dolores led the effort to desegregate the schools who were part of the Pasadena Unified School District (PUSD). After PUSD had failed to integrate its schools, they were sued by community members resulting in the 1970 landmark case of Spangler vs. the Pasadena City Board of Education. Dolores did everything she could to help the plaintiffs and organized hundreds of residents in the Pasadena area to support them, while at the same time educating people about the racial segregation affecting the school district. Due to the monumental efforts of Dolores and members of the community, the case went up to the U.S. District Court, which ultimately determined that racial segregation existed at all levels of PUSD. As a result, Pasadena was integrated and became the first school district west of the Mississippi to have crosstown bussing.

Dolores also went to great lengths to raise the visibility of African Americans in government. During her early years in Pasadena, Dolores noticed that few African Americans in the community attended city council meetings. They saw the lack of representation in their local government and rightly believed their voices would not be heard. Dolores made it her mission to correct this problem and deliver the representation the African American community deserved. Through hard work and determination, Dolores helped to elect Pasadena's first African-American and second female mayor, Loretta Thompson-Glickman, in 1977, and later served as her field representative. Dolores went on to serve in other important political roles, including as a staff member for California State Senators Walter Stiern, Richard Polanco, and Jack Scott.

Dolores had so many interests and passions, serving on the boards of numerous community organizations from the League of Women Voters to the Pasadena Chapter of the National Women's Political Caucus to Pasadena City College. However, most impressive of all was her service in the Korean War. Dolores was one of the few women serving in the United States Army, and one of the few people of color. Even though the odds were against her, she excelled in her position and was recognized as an outstanding basic trainee. Dolores never forgot her service in the military and joined organizations like American Legion Post 13 so that she could provide support to struggling Veterans. Throughout her years, she made it a priority to help Veterans in the community and was a crucial part in establishing a Veteran's Community Based Outpatient Clinic in the San Gabriel Valley. Dolores' commitment to her fellow veterans will live on and continue to serve those who were brave enough to stand beside her.

For her entire lifetime, Dolores Hickambottom broke barriers, built bridges, and strove to make the world a greater place. She was a hero to the community and her incredible legacy will forever serve as an inspiration to us all.

HONORING MR. DAVID MARZETTI

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2022

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. David Marzetti as the central coast of California celebrates the 20th anniversary of the Shagbag Radio Show. Mr. Marzetti is a pillar of the Monterey Peninsula and its airwaves. The Shagbag Radio Show has featured over 4,000 guests over 1,000 shows, cementing Mr. Marzetti's legacy as the Voice of Monterey.

Mr. Marzetti, originally from Canton, Ohio, has called the Monterey Peninsula home since 1989. Inspired by the beauty of the Central Coast, Mr. Marzetti left behind a behind a burgeoning East Coast radio career to become Program Director and Morning DJ at KOCN 105.1 FM, where he would work for the next 12 years.

In 2002, Mr. Marzetti developed the Shagbag Show, where over two decades, he would air over 1,000 shows and feature over 4,000 guests from all walks of life. Despite airing from the Del Monte Golf Course, Mr. Marzetti's guests extend far beyond golfers and golf enthusiasts, but include celebrities, athletes; local business owners, restaurateurs, writers, doctors, politicians, and more.

Mr. David Marzetti's dedication to the Central Coast and the Monterey Peninsula goes beyond his radio presence. In an effort to promote local businesses, he joined the Monterey County Convention and Visitors Bureau as its Membership Manager. He continues to be involved in the Peninsula's golf community, covering the U.S. Open and U.S. Amateur Championship golf tournaments at Pebble Beach and the AT&T Pebble Beach Pro-Am. Over 30 years, Mr. Marzetti has interviewed hundreds of professional and celebrity players, bringing his enthusiasm for the sport and the community to the airwaves.

Mr. Marzetti's dedication and enthusiasm has not gone unrecognized. He is a three-time winner of the PGA of Northern California Media Person of the Year and he was the first person bestowed with the Carmel Chamber of Commerce "Community Champion" Award.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Mr. Marzetti's long career in service to the Central Coast. I extend my personal appreciation to Mr. David Marzetti and his dedication to radio and entertainment.

RECOGNIZING LILLIAN J. GARDNER

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2022

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge an outstanding constituent from my district, Lillian J. Gardner, who has served the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) for nearly four decades. After achieving both a bachelor's degree in Business Logistics and a master's degree in Business Administration from the Pennsylvania State University, Lillian joined the Defense Personnel Support

Center (now the DLA) in 1983 as an Inventory Management Specialist. Since then, she has held a number of different positions within the agency, working tirelessly to support our Nation's warfighters and becoming an expert in the acquisition field.

Now, after 38 years of dedicated public service and professional leadership in the Department of Defense, Lillian is entering retirement. She concludes her impressive career as the Director and Chief of the Contracting Services Office. Widely respected for her accurate, strategic, and creative acquisition support to DLA's leaders, Lillian has also demonstrated an extraordinary ability to overcome complex and innumerable challenges, including those that have arisen because of the COVID-19 pandemic. Her dedication and diligence have contributed to keeping our military mission-ready.

We are incredibly grateful for the positive impact Lillian has had on our community and country throughout her time in government service, and we wish Lillian countless blessings during her retirement.

INTRODUCTION OF THE REDUCING HELICOPTER NOISE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ACT**HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON**

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2022

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce the Reducing Helicopter Noise in the District of Columbia Act, which would require all helicopters and rotocraft in the District of Columbia to fly at the maximum altitude permitted by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) in D.C., with limited exceptions. The exceptions would include active law enforcement and rescue operations, transporting the president and vice president and safety.

I hear from D.C. residents almost daily about helicopter noise. Helicopter noise can harm health, quality of life and the structural integrity of homes. In 2019, I led members of the National Capital Region (NCR) in requesting that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) study helicopter noise in the NCR. Last year, GAO issued its report. GAO found that there had been nearly 90,000 helicopter flights in the NCR from 2017 to 2019. GAO recommended that the FAA develop a mechanism to exchange helicopter noise information with operators in the NCR. The FAA indicated that it would implement such a mechanism, and I also introduced the Washington, DC Area Helicopter Noise Information Exchange Act of 2021 to require the FAA to implement such a mechanism.

I urge my colleagues to support the Reducing Helicopter Noise in the District of Columbia Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION**HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2022

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I rise today to state how I would have voted on Roll

Call No. 85, H.R. 6865, the Don Young Coast Guard Authorization Act. If I had been present, I would have voted "YEA" for the bill.

IN RECOGNITION OF WILHELMINA HENRY'S LIFETIME OF SERVICE AND IN CELEBRATION OF HER 100TH BIRTHDAY**HON. JERRY MCNERNEY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2022

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Wilhelmina Henry for a lifetime of service and to honor her on the 100th anniversary of her birth.

Born in Columbia, South Carolina on January 20, 1920, Mrs. Henry earned a degree from the Tuskegee Institute and began her teaching career after World War II in segregated schools in South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama. In 1947, she moved to Stockton, California and was appointed to a teaching position in the Stockton Unified School District—becoming Stockton's first teacher of color.

Mrs. Henry has made invaluable contributions to our local education system. She taught within the Stockton Unified School District until her retirement in 1994, ending her 52-year teaching career. In recognition of her role as a pioneer in education and a civil rights activist who broke the color barrier for teachers, the Wilhelmina Henry Elementary School in Stockton, California was named in her honor in 2006.

In addition to her invaluable contributions in education, Mrs. Henry and her husband, Reverend Edwin Henry, Sr., formed the Church of All Nations and the Henry Affordable Housing Program in Stockton. She remains an active member in the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, the Black Employees Association of Stockton Unified School District, the Ebenezer AME Church, the NAACP, and the Stockton Teachers Association.

Mrs. Henry is a trailblazer and role model, paving the way for many others who have followed in her footsteps. In celebration of her 100th birthday and lifetime of service, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Wilhelmina Henry.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, SERGEANT JOSHUA CAUDELL**HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2022

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Mr. Joshua Caudell, an Arkansas Department of Corrections Sergeant at the Tucker Unit in Tucker, Arkansas. Sergeant Caudell passed away on February 28, 2022, while providing assistance to his fellow officers.

Sergeant Caudell was a 10-year veteran of the Arkansas Department of Corrections, where he excelled as a Field Rider and K-9

Handler. He was also a veteran of the Army National guard, serving our nation honorably for eight years. In his free time, he enjoyed fishing and spending time with his family and friends. Above all else, Sergeant Caudell was a family man and the biggest supporter of his children, cheering them on at sporting events and frequently filling in as a coach for their sports teams.

I take this time today to honor Sergeant Caudell's exceptional service to his local community, his state, and his Nation. His service will live on as an example for those who will undoubtedly follow in his footsteps. I thank Sergeant Caudell and his family for their dedication to the citizens of the Fourth District of Arkansas and the United States of America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2022

Mr. EMMER. Madam Speaker, I was regretably unable to vote on H.R. 5657 (Roll Call 108) and H.R. 1916 (Roll Call 109) on April 4, 2022. Had I been present, I would have voted Yes on both measures.

PUTIN'S MASS MURDER

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2022

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, the civilized world is shocked at the discovery of mass murder by Putin in Bucha, Ukraine. It is inspiring the leadership of Presi-

dent Volodymyr Zelenskyy and the immediate responses by Germany to Italy for expelling Putin's murder-complicit diplomats.

With innocent civilians discovered having their hands tied behind their backs, shot in the head, it is clear, war criminal Putin must be stopped with immediate military aid. Biden is correct to recognize this as part of the worldwide conflict of democracy with rule of law versus autocracy with rule of gun.

An undisputed atrocity is the Putin detention of Mayor Olga Sukhenko of Motyzhyn (Ma-tajhin), her husband, Igor and her son, Alexander. Later, they were discovered murdered mercilessly in a shallow grave.

I have faith in the Russian people with a great culture betrayed by the war criminal, Putin. There is legislation for defecting Russian troops, diplomats, and Duma members to be provided expedited refugee status to America and up to \$100,000 for any Russian military equipment turned over to Ukraine. Ukraine will achieve victory.

God bless Ukraine. God save Ukraine. Long live Volodymyr Zelenskyy.

Congratulations to Mayor Dan Rickenmann and the city of Columbia for sending aid to Ukraine.

CONGRATULATING THE QUEENSBURY SPARTANS ON THEIR VALIANT EFFORT IN THE NEW YORK STATE HOCKEY SEMIFINALS

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2022

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Queensbury High School hockey team on an extraordinary sea-

son culminating in a great effort at the state semifinal game.

Due to the pandemic, the New York State high school hockey playoffs were unfortunately cancelled the last two seasons. However, prior to these cancellations, the Queensbury Spartans had built a reputation of playing at an extremely high level, appearing in the Final Four in back-to-back years. In the 2021–2022 season, under the leadership of Head Coach Dean Williams, the team of dedicated young men picked up right where they left off. The Spartans defeated John Jay High School in the quarterfinal game seven to five. Mack Ryan had a record-setting five-goal performance leading the Spartans to another opportunity to compete in the Final Four. In the semifinal game the Spartans faced New York's number one ranked team, the Pelham Pelicans of Westchester County.

The Queensbury Spartans put up a valiant effort against the Pelham Pelicans in the Division II semifinal game and came just short of appearing in their first state championship. Despite ultimately falling seven to one, the Spartans fought hard until the final buzzer. Pelham scored two goals in the game's first minute, and the Spartans faced an uphill battle the rest of the evening. Despite the outcome, Queensbury saw standout performances from Nick Ogden, who scored the team's only goal, and goalie Blake Powers, who had an impressive 34 saves in the game. With only four seniors on the roster, most of these young men will return ready to play hard next season. I am confident that Queensbury High School will field a highly competitive hockey program for years to come.

On behalf of New York's 21st Congressional District, I would like to congratulate the Queensbury Spartans on their incredible 2021–2022 season. We are very proud of their hard work and dedication throughout this year.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1949–S1987

Measures Introduced: Eighteen bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3991–4008. **Pages S1980–81**

Measures Passed:

Pray Safe Act: Senate passed S. 2123, to establish the Federal Clearinghouse on Safety and Security Best Practices for Faith-Based Organizations and Houses of Worship, after agreeing to the committee amendments. **Pages S1983–87**

Shadow Wolves Enhancement Act: Senate passed H.R. 5681, to authorize the reclassification of the tactical enforcement officers (commonly known as the “Shadow Wolves”) in the Homeland Security Investigations tactical patrol unit operating on the lands of the Tohono O’odham Nation as special agents. **Page S1987**

Measures Considered:

Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act: By 47 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 129), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 4373, making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022. **Page S1964**

Senator Schumer entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S1964**

Motion to Discharge Gordon Nomination: By 51 yeas to 50 nays, Vice President voting yea (Vote No. EX. 127), Senate agreed to the motion to discharge the nomination of Julia Ruth Gordon, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. Subsequently, the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar pursuant to the provisions of S. Res. 27, relative to Senate procedure in the 117th Congress. **Pages S1949–52**

Jackson Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Ketanji Brown Jackson, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. **Pages S1952–64, S1964–74**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Thursday, April 7, 2022. **Page S1952**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

By 53 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 128), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S1952**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination at approximately 10 a.m., on Wednesday, April 6, 2022; and that at 11:45 a.m., Senate execute the previous order of Monday, April 4, 2022 with respect to the nomination of James C. O’Brien, of Nebraska, to be Head of the Office of Sanctions Coordination, with the rank of Ambassador, Department of State, and vote on confirmation of the nomination. **Page S1987**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

Katherine Vidal, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office. **Pages S1974–75**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Vinay Vijay Singh, of Pennsylvania, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Robert F. Godec, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Thailand.

Kalpna Kotagal, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2027. **Page S1987**

Nomination Discharged: The following nomination were discharged from further committee consideration and placed on the Executive Calendar:

Julia Ruth Gordon, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, which was sent to the Senate on January 4, 2022, from the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Page S1987

Messages from the House: Page S1977

Measures Referred: Page S1977

Measures Read the First Time: Page S1977

Enrolled Bills Presented: Page S1977

Petitions and Memorials: Pages S1977–80

Executive Reports of Committees: Page S1980

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S1981–82

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S1982–83

Additional Statements: Pages S1976–77

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S1983

Privileges of the Floor: Page S1983

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—129) Page S1952, S1964

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:22 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, April 6, 2022. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1987.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of William A. LaPlante, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary for Acquisition and Sustainment, and Erik Kristopher Raven, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of the Navy, both of the Department of Defense, Musetta Tia Johnson, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, and Marvin L. Adams, of Texas, to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy.

USSOCOM AND USCYBERCOM POSTURE

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded open and closed hearings to examine the posture of United States Special Operations Command and United States Cyber Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2023 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Christopher P. Maier, Assistant Secretary for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Con-

flict, General Richard D. Clarke, USA, Commander, United States Special Operations Command, and General Paul M. Nakasone, USA, Commander, United States Cyber Command, all of the Department of Defense.

TRAINING CYBER OPERATORS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity concluded a closed hearing to examine training the next generation of cyber operators, after receiving testimony from Lieutenant General Stephen G. Fogarty, USA, Commander, United States Army Cyber Command, Vice Admiral Ross Myers, USN, Commander, United States Fleet Cyber Command, Lieutenant General Timothy D. Haugh, USAF, Commander, 16th Air Force, Major General Ryan P. Heritage, USMC, Commander, United States Marine Corps Forces Cyberspace Command, and Major General Kevin Kennedy, USAF, Chief of Operations, United States Cyber Command, all of the Department of Defense.

INSIDER TRADING LEGISLATION

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine insider trading legislation, focusing on fair markets, including S. 3990, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prohibit certain securities trading and related communications by those who possess material, nonpublic information, H.R. 6553, to promote a 21st century artificial intelligence workforce, S. 3730, to ensure a complete analysis of the potential impacts of rules on small entities, S. 3980, to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study of the costs associated with small- and medium-sized companies to undertake initial public offerings, S. 3919, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide that an issuer that is required to file certain quarterly reports may elect to file those reports semiannually, S. 3923, to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to repeal certain provisions requiring non-material disclosure, S. 3945, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to address the solicitation of proxy with respect to securities, S. 3097, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow for the registration of venture exchanges, S. 3976, to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to address entities that are not considered to be investment companies for the purposes of that Act, S. 3914, to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise the definition of a qualifying investment, for purposes of the exemption from registration for venture capital fund advisers under the

Investment Advisers Act of 1940, to include an equity security issued by a qualifying portfolio company and to include an investment in another venture capital fund, S. 3939, to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to provide small issuers with a micro-offering exemption free of mandated disclosures or offering filings, but subject to the antifraud provisions of the Federal securities laws, S. 3922, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to create a safe harbor for finders and private placement brokers, S. 3391, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to establish a registration exemption for merger and acquisition brokers, S. 3931, to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to extend exemptions for securities offered as part of employee pay to other individuals providing goods for sale, labor, or services for remuneration, S. 3948, to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to prohibit limitations on closed-end companies investing in private funds, S. 3967, to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to preempt State securities law requiring registration for secondary transactions, S. 3921, to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to expand the definition of a qualifying accredited investor, S. 3966, to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to define secondary offerings of Regulation A tier 2 securities as covered securities for purposes of an exemption from State regulation, S. 3921, to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to expand the definition of a qualifying accredited investor, S. 3631, to prohibit stock trading and ownership by Members of Congress and spouses of Members of Congress, and S. 2360, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to issue rules that prohibit officers and directors of certain companies from trading securities in anticipation of a current report, after receiving testimony from Robert J. Jackson, Jr., New York University School of Law, and John C. Coffee, Jr., Columbia University Law School, both of New York, New York; M. Todd Henderson, University of Chicago Law School, Chicago, Illinois; and David R. Burton, The Heritage Foundation, Washington, D.C.

CORPORATE PROFITS AND RISING PRICES

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine corporate profits and rising prices, after receiving testimony from Robert B. Reich, University of California, Berkeley; Lindsay Owens, Groundwork Collaborative, Washington, D.C.; and Michael Faulkender, University of Maryland, College Park.

PETROLEUM MARKETS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine ensuring transparency in the petroleum markets, after receiving testimony from Robert McCullough, McCullough Research, Portland, Oregon; and Kathleen Sgamma, Western Energy Alliance, Denver, Colorado.

DRINKING WATER AND WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, and Water concluded a hearing to examine implementation of the Drinking Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Act, focusing on stakeholders' needs and experiences, after receiving testimony from Senator Booker; Mayor Ras J. Baraka, Newark, New Jersey; Josh Schimmel, National Association of Clean Water Agencies, Springfield, Massachusetts; Susan Parker Bodine, Earth and Water Law, Chevy Chase, Maryland; and Mark Pepper, Wyoming Association of Rural Water Systems, Glenrock.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES BUDGET

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2023 for the Department of Health and Human Services, after receiving testimony from Xavier Becerra, Secretary of Health and Human Services.

FDA USER FEE AGREEMENTS

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Food and Drug Administration user fee agreements, focusing on advancing medical product regulation and innovation for the benefit of patients after receiving testimony from Cartier Esham, Biotechnology Innovation Organization, Mark Leahey, Medical Device Manufacturers Association, and Liz Richardson, The Pew Charitable Trusts, all of Washington, D.C.; and David R. Gaugh, Association for Accessible Medicines, Alexandria, Virginia.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 18 public bills, H.R. 7393–7410; and 5 resolutions, H. Res. 1028–1032 were introduced. **Pages H4190–91**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4191–92**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Payne to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4155**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:36 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H4159**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

School and Daycare Protection Act: H.R. 6387, amended, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a school security coordinating council; **Pages H4161–62**

Department of Homeland Security Inspector General Transparency Act: H.R. 5633, amended, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance transparency regarding reports conducted by the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security; **Pages H4162–64**

Reporting Efficiently to Proper Officials in Response to Terrorism Act: H.R. 1540, amended, to provide for joint reports by relevant Federal agencies to Congress regarding incidents of terrorism; **Pages H4164–65**

DHS Illicit Cross-Border Tunnel Defense Act: H.R. 4209, amended, to support remediation of illicit cross-border tunnels; **Pages H4165–68**

DHS Trade and Economic Security Council Act: H.R. 4476, amended, to establish the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Trade and Economic Security Council and the position of Assistant Secretary for Trade and Economic Security within the Department of Homeland Security, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nay vote of 348 yeas to 75 nays, Roll No. 112; **Pages H4168–70, H4181–82**

Resilient Assistance for Mitigation for Environmentally Resilient Infrastructure and Construction by Americans Act: H.R. 5689, amended, to improve the provision of Federal resources to help build capacity and fund risk-reducing, cost-effective mitigation projects for eligible State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments and certain private non-

profit organizations, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nay vote of 383 yeas to 41 nays, Roll No. 113; **Pages H4170–75, H4182–83**

Small Project Efficient and Effective Disaster Recovery Act: H.R. 5641, amended, to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to increase the threshold for eligibility for assistance under sections 403, 406, 407, and 502 of such Act, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nay vote of 414 yeas to 11 nays, Roll No. 114; and **Pages H4175–77, H4183**

Calling on the United States Government to uphold the founding democratic principles of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and establish a Center for Democratic Resilience within the headquarters of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization: H. Res. 831, amended, calling on the United States Government to uphold the founding democratic principles of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and establish a Center for Democratic Resilience within the headquarters of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nay vote of 362 yeas to 63 nays, Roll No. 115. **Pages H4177–80, H4184**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:17 p.m. and reconvened at 2:45 p.m. **Page H4180**

Suspensions—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures. Consideration began Monday, April 4th.

Data Mapping to Save Moms' Lives Act: H.R. 1218, amended, to require the Federal Communications Commission to incorporate data on maternal health outcomes into its broadband health maps, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nay vote of 409 yeas to 11 nays, Roll No. 110; and **Page H4180**

Spectrum Coordination Act: H.R. 2501, amended, to require the National Telecommunications and Information Administration and the Federal Communications Commission to update the memorandum of understanding on spectrum coordination, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nay vote of 418 yeas to 6 nays, Roll No. 111. **Pages H4180–81**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Six yeas-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4180, H4180–81, H4181–82, H4182–83, H4183, and H4184.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

Committee Meetings

A 2022 REVIEW OF THE FARM BILL: ENERGY-RENEWABLE ENERGY OPPORTUNITIES IN RURAL AMERICA

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “A 2022 Review of the Farm Bill: Energy-Renewable Energy Opportunities in Rural America”. Testimony was heard from Xochitl Torres Small, Under Secretary for Rural Development, Department of Agriculture; and public witnesses.

UNITED STATES STRATEGIC COMMAND

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing entitled “United States Strategic Command”. Testimony was heard from Admiral Charles A. Richard, Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, Department of Defense. This hearing was closed.

NATIONAL TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS PUBLIC WITNESS HEARING FOR FY23

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “National Tribal Organizations Public Witness Hearing for FY23”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a budget hearing on the Government Accountability Office. Testimony was heard from Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office; and Orice Williams Brown, Chief Operating Officer, Government Accountability Office.

APPROPRIATIONS—CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a budget hearing on the Congressional Budget Office. Testimony was heard from Phillip Swagel, Director, Congressional Budget Office.

APPROPRIATIONS—OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL WORKPLACE RIGHTS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a budget hearing on the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights. Testimony was heard from Teresa M. James, Acting Executive Director, Office of Congressional Workplace Rights; and John D. Uelmen, General Counsel, Office of Congressional Workplace Rights.

FISCAL YEAR 2023 DEFENSE BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2023 Defense Budget Request”. Testimony was heard from Lloyd J. Austin III, Secretary, Department of Defense; and General Mark A. Milley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Department of Defense.

OPERATIONS IN CYBERSPACE AND BUILDING CYBER CAPABILITIES ACROSS THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Cyber, Innovative Technologies, and Information Systems held a hearing entitled “Operations in Cyberspace and Building Cyber Capabilities Across the Department of Defense”. Testimony was heard from John F. Plumb, Incoming Principal Cyber Advisor to the Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense; General Paul M. Nakasone, U.S. Army, Commander, U.S. Cyber Command and Director, National Security Agency, Department of Defense.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Education and Labor: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 7309, the “Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act of 2022”; and H.R. 7310, the “Protecting America’s Retirement Security Act”. H.R. 7309 and H.R. 7310 were ordered reported, as amended.

COMMUNITIES IN NEED: LEGISLATION TO SUPPORT MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL- BEING

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Communities in Need: Legislation to Support Mental Health and Well-Being”. Testimony was heard from Miriam E. Delphin-Rittmon, Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services; Carole Johnson, Administrator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

AN ENDURING LEGACY: THE ROLE OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS IN THE HORRORS OF SLAVERY AND THE NEED FOR ATONEMENT

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “An Enduring Legacy: The Role of Financial Institutions in the Horrors of Slavery and the Need for Atonement”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 7312, to prohibit participation of the Russian Federation in the G7; H.R. 7276, the “Ukraine Invasion War Crimes Deterrence and Accountability Act”; H.R. 7311, the “Countering Malign Russian Activities in Africa Act”; H.R. 6930, the “Asset Seizure for Ukraine Reconstruction Act”; H.R. 7340, to provide for congressional oversight of certain sanctions imposed with respect to the Russian Federation; H.R. 7338, the “Russia Cryptocurrency Transparency Act”; H.R. 7372, the “Protecting Semiconductor Supply Chains from Putin Act”; H.R. 923, the “Georgia Support Act”; H.R. 7314, the “AXIS Act”; H. Res. 833, expressing support for Moldova’s democracy, independence, and territorial integrity and strengthening United States and Moldova relations; and H.R. 3344, the “Transatlantic Telecommunications Security Act”. H.R. 7276, H.R. 923, H.R. 7311, H.R. 7338, H.R. 7372, H. Res. 833, H.R. 3344, and H.R. 6930 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 7312, H.R. 7340, and H.R. 7314 were ordered reported, without amendment.

**MOBILIZING OUR CYBER DEFENSES:
SECURING CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE
AGAINST RUSSIAN CYBER THREATS**

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Mobilizing our Cyber Defenses: Securing Critical Infrastructure Against Russian Cyber Threats”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

**ENHANCING THE FOREIGN AGENTS
REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938**

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties held a hearing entitled “Enhancing the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938”. Testimony was heard from Jacob R. Straus, Specialist on the Congress, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 350, the “Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act of 2021”; H.R. 5460, the “Virgin Islands Visa Waiver Act of 2021”; H.R. 301, to amend title 36, United States Code, to establish the composition known as “Lift Every Voice and Sing” as the national hymn of the United States; H.R. 7072, the “NDO Fairness Act”; H.R. 4330, the “PRESS Act”; H.R. 3648, the “EAGLE Act of 2021”; H.R. 6577, the “Real Courts, Rule of Law Act of 2022”; and H.R. 1924, the “Kenneth P. Thompson Begin Again Act”.

**INVESTING IN WILDFIRE MANAGEMENT,
ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, AND
RESILIENT COMMUNITIES: EXAMINING
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BIPARTISAN
INFRASTRUCTURE LAW**

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands held a hearing entitled “Investing in Wildfire Management, Ecosystem Restoration, and Resilient Communities: Examining Implementation of the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law”. Testimony was heard from Jeff Rupert, Director, Office of Wildland Fire, Department of the Interior; Jaelith Hall-Rivera, Deputy Chief, State and Private Forestry, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; and Brian Ferebee, Chief Executive of Intergovernmental Relations, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

**THE OPIOID CRISIS IN TRIBAL
COMMUNITIES**

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “The Opioid Crisis in Tribal Communities”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

**IT’S ELECTRIC: DEVELOPING THE POSTAL
SERVICE FLEET OF THE FUTURE**

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “It’s Electric: Developing the Postal Service Fleet of the Future”. Testimony was heard from Tammy L. Whitcomb, Inspector General, U.S. Postal Service; Victoria K Stephen, Executive Director, Next Generation Delivery Vehicle, U.S. Postal Service; Jill M. Naamane, Acting Director, Physical Infrastructure Team, General Services Administration; and public witnesses.

**RESTAURANT REVITALIZATION FUND
REPLENISHMENT ACT OF 2021**

Committee on Rules: Full Committee began a hearing on H.R. 3807, the “Restaurant Revitalization Fund Replenishment Act of 2021” [Relief for Restaurants and other Hard Hit Small Businesses Act of 2022]. Testimony was heard from Chairman Velázquez, and Representatives Luetkemeyer, Pannetta, Fitzpatrick, Quigley, and Greene of Georgia.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 6845, the “Commercial Remote Sensing Amendment Act of 2022”; H.R. 3952, the “NOAA Chief Scientist Act”; H.R. 7077, the “Empowering the U.S. Fire Administration Act”; H.R. 3588, the “Mathematical and Statistical Modeling Education Act”; and H.R. 6933, the “Cost-Share Accountability Act of 2022”.

H.R. 6845, H.R. 3952, and H.R. 7077 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 3588 and H.R. 6933 were ordered reported, without amendment.

FEMA PRIORITIES FOR 2022 AND THE 2022–2026 STRATEGIC PLAN

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management held a hearing entitled “FEMA Priorities for 2022 and the 2022–2026 Strategic Plan”. Testimony was heard from Deanne Criswell, Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 2022

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimate and justification for fiscal year 2023 for the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation, 10 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel, to hold hearings to examine suicide prevention and related behavioral health interventions in the Department of Defense, 10 a.m., SR–222.

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, to hold hearings to examine the Department of Defense's posture for supporting and fostering innovation, 2:30 p.m., SR–222.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Ventris C. Gibson, of Virginia, to be Director of the Mint for a term of five years, and Paul M. Rosen, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Investment Security, both of the Department of the Treasury, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development, to hold hearings to examine advancing public transportation in small cities and rural places under the bipartisan infrastructure law, 2:30 p.m., SD–538/VTC.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2023 for the Environmental Protection Agency, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Subcommittee on Clean Air, Climate, and Nuclear Safety, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Beth Pritchard Geer, Robert P. Klein, both of Tennessee, and L. Michelle Moore, of Georgia, all to be a Member of the Board of Directors, and Benny R. Wagner, of Tennessee, to be Inspector General, all of the Tennessee Valley Authority, 2:30 p.m., SD–406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine amendments to the Treaty on Fisheries between the Governments of Certain Pacific Island States and the Government of the United States of America (Treaty Doc.115–03), agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Croatia comprising the instrument as contemplated by Article 3(2) of the Agreement on Extradition between the United States of America and the European Union, signed June 25, 2003, as to the Application of the Treaty on Extradition signed on October 25, 1901 (the “U.S.-Croatia Extradition Agreement”), and the Agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of Croatia comprising the Instrument as contemplated by Article 3(3) of the Agreement on Mutual Legal Assistance between the United States of America and the European Union signed at Washington on June 25, 2003 (the “U.S.-Croatia Mutual Legal Assistance Agreement”), both signed at Washington on December 10, 2019 (Treaty Doc. 116–02), and amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (the “Montreal Protocol”), adopted at Kigali on October 15, 2016, by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (the “Kigali Amendment”) (Treaty Doc. 117–01), 2:30 p.m., SD–106/VTC.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: business meeting to consider the nominations of Derek Kan, of California, and Daniel Mark Tangherlini, of the District of Columbia, both to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service, 11:15 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 3123, to amend the Siletz Reservation Act to address the hunting, fishing, trapping, and animal gathering rights of the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, S. 3126, to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act to address the hunting, fishing, trapping, and animal gathering rights of the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community, S. 3273, to take certain land in the State of California into trust for the benefit of the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, H.R. 1975, to take certain land located in San Diego County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Pala Band of Mission Indians, and H.R. 4881, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust for the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona certain land in Pima County, Arizona, 2:30 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on Rules and Administration: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Dara Lindenbaum, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission, 3:15 p.m., SR–301.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Kate Elizabeth Heinzelman, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Full Committee, to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Livestock and Foreign Agriculture, hearing entitled “A 2022 Review of the Farm Bill: International Trade and Food Assistance Programs”, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth and Zoom.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Defense, hearing entitled “United States Africa Command”, 9:30 a.m., H-140. This hearing is closed.

Subcommittee on Homeland Security, budget hearing on U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, 10 a.m., Zoom.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Social and Emotional Learning and Whole Child Approaches in K-12 Education”, 10 a.m., Zoom.

Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, hearing entitled “U.S. International Assistance to Combat Narcotics Trafficking”, 10 a.m., Zoom.

Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Department of Veterans Affairs, 10:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn and Zoom.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Regional Tribal Organizations Public Witness Hearing for FY23”, 1 p.m., Zoom.

Subcommittee on Homeland Security, budget hearing on the Office of Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security, 1:30 p.m., Zoom.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the House of Representatives, 2 p.m., 2362-B Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2023 Strategic Forces National Security Space Programs”, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Department of Health and Human Services FY 2023 Budget”, 2:30 p.m., 210 Cannon and Zoom.

Committee on Education and Labor, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Examining the Policies and Priorities of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services”, 9 a.m., 2175 Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “Gouged at the Gas Station: Big Oil and America’s Pain at the Pump”, 10:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Annual Testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of the International Financial System”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Restoring American Leadership in the Indo-Pacific”, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Innovation, hearing entitled “Mobilizing our Cyber Defenses: Maturing Public-Private Partnerships to Secure U.S. Critical Infrastructure”, 10 a.m., 310 Cannon and Webex.

Subcommittee on Border Security, Facilitation, and Operations, hearing entitled, “Examining Title 42 and

the Need to Restore Asylum at the Border”, 2 p.m., 310 Cannon and Webex.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, continue markup on H.R. 350, the “Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act of 2021”; H.R. 5460, the “Virgin Islands Visa Waiver Act of 2021”; H.R. 301, to amend title 36, United States Code, to establish the composition known as “Lift Every Voice and Sing” as the national hymn of the United States; H.R. 7072, the “NDO Fairness Act”; H.R. 4330, the “PRESS Act”; H.R. 3648, the “EAGLE Act of 2021”; H.R. 6577, the “Real Courts, Rule of Law Act of 2022”; and H.R. 1924, the “Kenneth P. Thompson Begin Again Act”, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 920, the “Brown v. Board of Education National Historic Site Expansion Act”; H.R. 1638, the “Gilt Edge Mine Conveyance”; H.R. 2626, the “Pullman National Historical Park Act”; H.R. 5093, the “Wind River Administrative Site Conveyance Act”; and H.R. 6651, the “Alaska Salmon Research Task Force Act”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1756, the “Measuring Real Income Growth Act”; H.R. 6531, the “Targeting Resources to Communities in Need Act of 2022”; H.R. 6967, the “Chance to Compete Act”; H.R. 7376, the “Honoring Civil Servants Killed in the Line of Duty Act”; H.R. 5815, the “Honest Census Communications Act”; H.R. 7185, the “Federal Contracting for Peace and Security Act”; H.R. 3544, the “Computers for Veterans and Students Act”; H.R. 7337, the “Access for Veterans to Records Act”; and H.R. 6039, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 501 Charles Street in Beaufort, South Carolina, as the “Harriet Tubman Post Office Building”; H.R. 6041, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10 Bow Circle in Hilton Head Island, South Carolina, as the “Charles E. Fraser Post Office Building”; H.R. 6042, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 213 William Hilton Parkway in Hilton Head Island, South Carolina, as the “Casear H. Wright Jr. Post Building”; H.R. 6175, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 135 West Wisconsin Street in Russell, Kansas, as the “Robert J. Dole Memorial Post Office Building”; H.R. 6614, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4744 Grand River Avenue in Detroit, Michigan, as the “Rosa Louise McCauley Parks Post Office Building”; H.R. 6917, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 301 East Congress Parkway in Crystal Lake, Illinois, as the “Ryan J. Cummings Post Office Building”; H.R. 1095, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 101 South Willowbrook Avenue in Compton, California, as the “PFC James Anderson, Jr., Post Office Building”; H.R. 4622, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 226 North Main Street in Roseville, Ohio, as the “Ronald E. Rosser Post Office Building”; H.R. 5809, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1801 Town and Country Drive

in Norco, California, as the “Lance Corporal Kareem Nikoui Memorial Post Office Building”; H.R. 5349, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1550 State Road S-38-211 in Orangeburg, South Carolina, as the “J.I. Washington Post Office Building”; H.R. 5865, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4110 Bluebonnet Drive in Stafford, Texas, as the “Leonard Scarcella Post Office Building”; and H.R. 5900, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2016 East 1st Street in Los Angeles, California, as the “Marine Corps Reserve PVT Jacob Cruz Post Office Building”, 10:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, continue hearing on H.R. 3807, the “Restaurant Revitalization Fund Replenishment Act of 2021” [Relief for Restaurants and other Hard Hit Small Businesses Act of 2022], 11 a.m., H-313 Capitol and Webex.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Research and Technology, hearing entitled “SBIR Turns 40: Evaluating Support for Small Business Innovation”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Underserved, Agricultural, and Rural Business Development, hearing entitled “SBA Management Review: Office of Advocacy”, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, hearing entitled “National Transportation Safety Board Reauthorization”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 5738, the “Lactation Spaces for Veteran Moms Act”; H.R. 6961, the “Dignity for MST Survivors Act”; H.R. 2724, the “VA Peer Support Enhancement for MST Survivors Act”; H.R. 7335, the “Improving Military Sexual Trauma Claims Coordination Act”; H.R. 6052, the “VA OIG Training Act”; H.R. 7277, the “Improving Oversight of VA Community Care Providers Act of 2022”; legislation on Improving VA Workforce through

Minority Serving Institutions; H.R. 2428, the “Strengthening Oversight for Veterans Act of 2021”; H.R. 7369, the “VENTURE Act”; H.R. 6376, the “Student Veteran Work Study Modernization Act”; legislation on VA Foreign School Payments; H.R. 2326, the “Veterans Cyber Risk Awareness Act”; H.R. 7158, the “Long-Term Care Veterans Choice Act”; H.R. 5754, the “Patient Advocate Tracker Act”; H.R. 6064, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to seek to enter into an agreement with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine for a review of examinations, furnished by the Secretary, to individuals who submit claims to the Secretary for compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, for mental and physical conditions linked to military sexual trauma; H.R. 7153, the “Department of Veterans Affairs Principles of Benefits Automation Act”; and H.R. 6604, the “VETS Credit Act”, 10:30 a.m., HVC-210 and Zoom.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Overcoming Racism to Advance Economic Opportunity”, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth and Webex.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Compartmented Hearing”, 10 a.m., HVC-304 Hearing Room. This hearing is closed.

Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Congressional Continuity: Ensuring the First Branch is Prepared in Times of Crisis”, 9 a.m., 1334 Longworth and Zoom.

Select Committee on Economic Disparity and Fairness in Growth, Full Committee, hearing entitled “(Im)Balance of Power: How Market Concentration Affects Worker Compensation and Consumer Prices”, 12 p.m., 2362-A Rayburn and Zoom.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to hold hearings to examine ways to counter tactics oligarchs use to launder their money and reputations and stifle dissent, 2:30 p.m., SD-562.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Wednesday, April 6

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Ketanji Brown Jackson, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

At 11:45 a.m., Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination of James C. O'Brien, of Nebraska, to be Head of the Office of Sanctions Coordination, with the rank of Ambassador, Department of State.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, April 6

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of measures under suspension of the Rules.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E355
Chu, Judy, Calif., E356
Comer, James, Ky., E355
Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E357

Doyle, Michael F., Pa., E355
Emmer, Tom, Minn., E358
Fitzpatrick, Brian K., Pa., E357
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E356
McNerney, Jerry, Calif., E357
Morelle, Joseph D., N.Y., E355

Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E357
Panetta, Jimmy, Calif., E357
Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E356, E358
Westerman, Bruce, Ark., E356, E357
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E358



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.